CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW

October — December 1959

LONDON
S·P·C·K
1959

Published by S.P.C.K.
Holy Trinity Church, Marylebone Road, London, N.W.1

Printed in Great Britain by
The Talbot Press (S.P.C.K.), Saffron Walden, Essex

CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

The Rev. Leonard Hodgson, D.D.
The Very Rev. E. S. Abbott, Dean of Westminster
The Rt Rev. R. C. Mortimer, Bishop of Exeter.
The Rev. Canon Charles Smyth.

EDITOR

The Rt Rev. and Rt Hon. J. W. C. Wand, K.C.V.O., D.D.

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL

JANE AUSTEN'S CLERGYMEN — *E. G. Selwyn*

FIVE POETS ON RELIGION. 2. COWPER AND BLAKE — *Arthur Pollard*

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE PASSION AND THE QUMRAN CALENDAR — *C. S. Mann*

WAS ST PAUL A JEWISH MISSIONARY? — *Harry Sawyerr*

LONDON PURITANISM: THE PARISH OF ST STEPHEN, COLEMAN STREET — *Dorothy Ann Williams*

WILLIAM WILBERFORCE—1759-1833 — *Laurence Larter*

THE DOCTRINE OF GRACE — *C. B. Armstrong*

PASTORAL PSYCHOLOGY — *Norman Small*

A MOVEMENT IN CLERICAL EDUCATION — *T. F. Taylor*

REVIEWS

A detailed list of books and reviewers appears on the following pages.

REVIEWS

GEDDES MACGREGOR: *Corpus Christi: The Nature of the Church according to the Reformed Tradition.* By E. L. Mascall

R. KELF-COHEN: *Nationalisation in Britain; The End of a Dogma.* By the Bishop of Southwark

G. W. ANDERSON: *A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament;* A. W. HEATHCOTE: *From the Death of Solomon to the Captivity of Judah.* By J. Robinson

BERNHARD W. ANDERSON: *The Living World of the Old Testament.* By U. E. Simon

H. L. ELLISON: *Men Spake from God.* By J. Robinson

N. H. SNAITH (ed.): *The Old Testament in Hebrew.* By J. Robinson

T. HENSHAW: *The Latter Prophets.* By J. Robinson

D. WINTON THOMAS (ed.): *Documents from Old Testament Times.* By C. Witton-Davies

H. L. ELLISON: *From Tragedy to Triumph: Studies in the Book of Job.* By H. F. D. Sparks

ADAM C. WELCH: *Visions of the End: A Study in Daniel and Revelation.* By G. J. Inglis

KARL BARTH: *Church Dogmatics. Vol. III, The Doctrine of Creation. Pt. 1.* By C. J. Barker

KARL BARTH: *Church Dogmatics. Vol. IV, The Doctrine of Reconciliation. Pt. 2.* By C. J. Barker

KARL BARTH: *A Shorter Commentary on Romans.* By D. E. Jenkins

E. RIDLEY LEWIS: *The Life and Teaching of Jesus.* By J. S. Bezzant

ALF CORELL: *Consummatum Est.* By Adam Fox

S. E. JOHNSON: *Jesus in his own Times.* By E. O. James

WILLIAM BARCLAY: *The Mind of St Paul.* By Marcus Knight

KARL BORNHAUSER: *The Death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ.* By Marcus Knight

ADRIAN HASTINGS: *Prophet and Witness in Jerusalem.* By S. M. Gibbard. S.S.J.E.

JAMES T. HUDSON: *The Pauline Epistles: Their Meaning and Message.* By C. B. Armstrong

JOACHIM WACH: *The Comparative Study of Religions.* By E. O. James

RAY FREEMAN JENNEY: *Bible Primer.* By A. O. Standen

G. D. YARNOLD: *Risen Indeed.* By the Editor

R. P. C. HANSON: *Allegory and Event.* By S. L. Greenslade

M. C. D'ARCY, S.J.: *The Sense of History: Secular and Sacred.* By W. R. Matthews

S. C. CARPENTER: *Eighteenth Century Church and People.* By the Editor

Journal of the Historical Society of the Church in Wales. Vol. VIII. By Gordon Huelin

R. V. H. BURNE: *Chester Cathedral.* By Seiriol Evans

A. O. J. COCKSHUT: *Anglican Attitudes.* By the Editor

G. C. B. DAVIES: *The First Evangelical Bishop: Some Aspects of the Life of Henry Ryder.* By C. H. Smyth

CRISOGONO DE JESUS: *The Life of St John of the Cross.* By C. S. Mann, O.S.B.

BETSY RODGERS: *Georgian Chronicle.* By Gordon Huelin

H. E. W. TURNER: *The Meaning of the Cross;* E. K. LEE: *The Meaning of Salvation.* By F. W. Dillistone

C. A. COULSON: *Science and Christian Belief.* By E. L. Mascall

RICHARD S. WESTFALL: *Science and Religion in Seventeenth-Century England.* By E. L. Mascall

BASIL MINCHIN: *Covenant and Sacrifice.* By G. W. O. Addleshaw

ARCHIMANDRITE SOFRONY: *The Undistorted Image: Staretz Silouan, 1866-1938.* By R. M. French

A. H. DAMMERS: *Great Venture.* By R. D. Say

A RELIGIOUS OF C.S.M.V.: *These Last Days.* By S. M. Gibbard, S.S.J.E.

MICHAEL C. PERRY: *The Easter Enigma.* By H. A. Blair

ARTHUR GUIRDHAM: *Christ and Freud.* By R. S. Lee

BERNARD LORD MANNING: *Why not Abandon the Church?* By Frederic Hood

Some reviews have had to be held over owing to heavy demands on our space.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

The Very Reverend E. G. SELWYN, D.D., who died last June, was Dean of Winchester from 1931 to 1958, and edited *Theology* from 1920 to 1933.

Mr ARTHUR POLLARD is Lecturer in English Literature in the University of Manchester.

The Reverend C. S. MANN, O.S.B., is a Novice of Nashdom Abbey.

The Reverend H. A. E. SAWYERR, M.B.E., M.A., is Head of the Department of Theology, Fourah Bay College, Sierra Leone.

Miss D. A. WILLIAMS, PH.D., after teaching history at Washington University and holding the posts of Associate Professor of History at Lindenwood College, St Charles, Missouri, and at Principia College, Elsah, Illinois, is now engaged upon research on early seventeenth-century Puritanism in London.

The Reverend LAURENCE LARTER is a Methodist Minister, and is at present Superintendent of the Pateley Bridge Circuit, in Yorkshire.

Canon C. B. ARMSTRONG, B.D., is a Canon Residentiary of Worcester Cathedral.

The Reverend L. N. SMALL is Vicar of St Ethelburga's, Bishopsgate, London, E.C.2.

The Reverend T. F. TAYLOR is Vicar of Chalford, Gloucestershire.

The price of the *Church Quarterly Review* has remained at 6s. a copy since January 1921, when it was raised from 5s. This has been made possible, during a period of constant rises in costs, by increases both in the circulation and in the subsidy put up by the publishers. Although the circulation has grown considerably during the last few years, the latest increases in production costs make it impossible any longer to avoid asking subscribers to bear part of the extra expenditure. Accordingly, the price per copy will be raised as from January 1960 to 7s. 6d., and the annual subscription to 25s., post free in each case. This step has been taken with reluctance, but we have no doubt that even at this higher price the *C.Q.R.* is unusually good value for the money. Readers can help to stabilize the price at this level by making the journal known to their friends and encouraging new subscriptions.

EDITORIAL

On 27 May the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland rejected the proposal of "bishops in presbytery" as a means towards union with the Church of England. For this rejection there seem to be three main reasons, first an objection to bishops in any form, second anger at the Anglican refusal to accept Presbyterians' sacraments as equally "valid" with our own, and third confidence on the part of many laymen in their position as an established Church and consequent refusal to play second fiddle to the big sister over the border.

The third of these reasons need not detain us here. But it is obviously such non-theological arguments that weigh most heavily with those (of whom there are many) who think that Christianity is mostly a matter of sentiment and who have no use for "dogmas and doctrines, forms and ceremonies".

With the first objection one is bound to have a good deal of sympathy. To expect bishops to be accepted by a body whose very name implies opposition to them is to ask a good deal. There lies some hope in the fact that the history of episcopacy is a matter of scholarship rather than of religious faith. In the long run historical research ought to be able to determine whether in the administration of the Church's affairs apostles were immediately succeeded by bishops, or not.

Until the sixteenth century there was never any widespread doubt on the subject. The Reformation provided variant solutions that proved mutually exclusive. It was left to Canon Streeter to lift a phrase from *Alice in Wonderland* and to say that we had all won prizes. Even the warmest admirers of Canon Streeter can be forgiven for regretting so improbable a judgement. Its epigrammatic expression has fastened hold on the popular imagination and it crops up in every discussion of the question, forestalling argument and preventing effort to get at the facts. It is in the opinion of many competent judges both nonsensical in itself and devoid of historical foundation. The notion that in the primitive Church each local community was free to organize itself as it thought fit is clean contrary to the whole tone of the New Testament with its emphasis upon authority and unity.

If we ask what form of government was employed, the simple answer is that the one and only form that emerged was episcopacy.

That is a quite simple fact which has been lost to sight under a whole heap of argument about what happened during the second half of the first century. Since by 115 the episcopate is commended by Ignatius of Antioch in a surprisingly definite, not to say monarchical form, one would have thought that whatever happened in the short interim after the passing away of the apostles must have led by very quick steps to the prominence of bishops. Indeed from the point of view of historical probabilities the only question worth arguing is whether the bishop was from the beginning a solitary figure or whether he was originally just one among a college of presbyters, who first assumed the presidency and then drew to himself the duties and privileges of a separate order. Was there one bishop in each local community or were there several presbyter-bishops?

What evidence has come to hand recently seems to suggest that there was always a presiding elder. The probability follows that he exercised the functions of general superintendence that we to-day associate with the episcopate. That the development took place under the initiative of the apostles can at least be presumed to have been likely. As for the importance of an unbroken succession, the argument for it is sufficiently stressed by the Fathers. As far as the first objection goes therefore, the historical evidence in favour of episcopacy is almost infinitely stronger than that against it.

The second objection has been allowed to assume an importance out of all proportion to its intrinsic character. Presbyterian pride is hurt because we cannot acknowledge the validity of their sacraments. Of course we cannot. Validity implies something that has been correctly done according to the essential rules. The whole point at issue is that Presbyterianism does not practise the rules as we know them. To ask us to accept the validity of their sacraments would involve us in a declaration that would be insincere if not actually dishonest.

It is a pity that the word validity was ever allowed to creep into the debate. In Australia its unsuitability in such negotiations was recognized from the outset of the interdenominational discussions and its use was carefully eschewed. This is not to say that the notion is not important. But the point about which we should argue is not whose sacraments are "valid" now, but what arrangements can be made for a ministry and sacraments satisfactory to all in the future. We shall do that only if we abstain from mutual

recriminations about the present and keep our minds firmly fixed upon the goal ahead.

It is not going to be at all easy to do that in the present state of opinion beyond the border. It would be well if there could now be a period of quiet recollection while each church considers the situation separately. As far as Anglicans are concerned we need time to pursue our talks with the Methodists. It is quite possible that these talks will be made more difficult than they need have been by the opposition we have elicited in Scotland. We ought not to have too many irons in the fire at once: we stand a far better chance of success if we pursue our enquiries one at a time. As far as home reunion is concerned, on every ground whether of history, theology, or propinquity the Methodists have the prior claim.

JANE AUSTEN'S CLERGYMEN[1]

E. G. SELWYN

UNTIL I read the novels carefully and continuously, I had never realized how Miss Austen's clergymen permeate her books. The main reason was, no doubt, that the men themselves seem to have so little connection with any kind of pastoral or parochial work, as we know it to-day. In certain cases, too, we are dealing not with parsons but with parsons-designate—at any rate I am including these in my survey. But of these things more anon. Meanwhile, let us remember that Miss Austen knew her facts. As the daughter of a clergyman and the sister of two others and devoted to all three, she was not likely to criticize the cloth unfairly; but when they do provoke mirth or hostility, then we may surmise that they represent a type which she had herself met with; and they cannot be understood without reference to the social and ecclesiastical system to which they belonged.

Socially, our authoress and her characters belong to what Sir Arthur Bryant has called "The Age of Elegance". Not only is elegance the outstanding feature of her own style; but it is a moral quality of high importance. Delicacy, considerateness, reserve, good taste, good manners—all these are part of it. It is desirable also in a man's or a woman's figure, and in the cut of his coat and of her gown. Yet character and appearance are not on the same footing. Mrs Elton's gown might be "very elegant"; but as to character, "ease, but not elegance" was Emma's verdict. There appear also—or am I dreaming?—certain faults of grammar which betoken the lack of elegance. "Neither Mr. Suckling nor me had ever any patience with them", is the voice of Mrs Elton. "My sister and me was often staying with my uncle", says Lucy Steele to Elinor Dashwood; "Anne and me are to go the latter end of January to some relatives"; "Kitty and me", writes Lydia Bennett several times, when she has become thoroughly vulgarized. And there are other examples. I hesitate to generalize; but this solecism (or should I say modernism, for it has become quite fashionable with the present younger generation?) struck me often enough to make me wonder

[1] This article was received on the very day that Dr Selwyn's death was announced. R.I.P. Ed.

whether Jane Austen used it deliberately as a mark of those of her characters who were deficient in elegance. At the same time elegance had its other side; and our authoress speaks without hesitation of "the elegant stupidity of private parties" providing the Elliotts, those perfect snobs, with their sole evening amusements; and of "the heartless elegance" of Anne's father and sister.

The title of this paper suggests to many minds one name above all other. "Oh, yes," they say, "of course, Mr Collins." True, Mr Collins has become in a unique sense amongst Jane Austen's characters, a household word. Yet, in fact, he is not of great importance for our purpose; indeed he is not even essential to the story of *Pride and Prejudice*. Rather, he stands as a kind of grotesque monolith at the entrance to the garden which Jane Austen has laid out for us. Pompous, selfish, and determined to marry, he comes charging like a bull into the Bennetts' house, feeling sure that the chance he offers of keeping the entail in the family will make his claims irresistible; and in this frame of mind makes the attractive Elizabeth his target and writes his famous letter. But like every object of ridicule, he is entitled if not to sympathy at least to justice. As a parson he seems to have had a very poor notion of his parish duties. But he did marry and marry well. Charlotte Lucas was a knight's daughter, and there is nothing to suggest that he did not make her content; and we know she regarded marriage as a woman's pleasantest preservative from want. That of course, is only negative evidence. But such as it is, he is entitled to it. Let us leave him at that—a clown, a figure of fun. Long ago Aristotle had written the truth about such men. "Comedy (he wrote) is an imitation of characters of a lower type—not, however, in the full sense of the word bad, the Ludicrous being merely a sub-division of the ugly. It consists in some defect or ugliness which is not painful or destructive."

The Church system in Jane Austen's lifetime was indeed extraordinary. There is no indication of any previous theological or pastoral training being required, other than perhaps a University degree, nor of any plan for testing a man's suitability for the Ministry, before he was ordained and even appointed to a benefice. Edmund Bertram had to go to Peterborough for a day before his Ordination there, but the visit is regarded not so much as one of preparation but a tiresome interruption in the course of other and more disturbing claims on his time. All that was needed was to

"find a bishop" who would ordain and institute to the living. James Morland was not yet through his Schools at Oxford when he wished to marry; and if I understand *Northanger Abbey* aright, his father's promise to appoint him to succeed him at Fullerton was part of the marriage settlement into which he entered with Isabella Thorpe. I understand that to-day this might be regarded as simony. Moreover, the abuse of non-residence was rife. You will remember the fierce discussion of this subject between Mary Crawford and Fanny in *Mansfield Park*, a discussion in which the novelist seems herself to be joining with passionate conviction. Mr Collins and Charles Hayter accepted the necessity of providing for their Sunday services and certain others if they themselves were absent. But they need not live in their parishes. Pluralism was rife (though perhaps not so successfully managed as in the days of William of Wykeham); and a large number of Church people regarded a "living" as just that, a house and income to live on rather than as a sphere of duty. We do not often realize how much we owe to the reforming movements which revolutionized the Church in the 1830's: to the later Evangelical movement under the guidance of Charles Simeon, whose watchword was "seriousness" rather than "enthusiasm"; to the administrative gift of Bishop Blomfield, also a Cambridge man, and the foundation of the Ecclesiastical Commission; and to the Oxford Movement which is commonly dated from Keble's Assize Sermon in 1833.

Mention of Simeon brings me back to Jane Austen. Curiously enough, this great man was himself an example of the system prevailing during her life. He was ordained on the title of his Fellowship at King's, as anyone might be to-day; but he had not in fact reached the canonical age; and he was appointed by the Bishop of Ely to the perpetual curacy of Trinity Church, Cambridge, before he was in full orders. One may respect the Bishop's desire to encourage a man of unquestioned vocation to the Ministry and of great learning; but Jane Austen's novels show that the results of breaking the Church's rules in such matters were unfortunately widespread. *Quis custodiet ipsos custodes?* However, that is a digression. The question I want to ask is how far Jane Austen may have come in touch with the Evangelical movement of her day and what influence this may have had upon her portrayal of the office and the characters of some of her clergy. The late Miss Sheila Kaye-Smith, no mean judge in a matter of this kind, was so much

impressed by the contrast between *Mansfield Park* and the other novels that she thought Jane Austen must have come under some strong outside influence shortly before writing it, and that this was the Evangelical movement. It is probable that many of the Bath churches were then, as in fact they still are, associated with the Evangelical tradition; as indeed, if we include Lyncombe and also Walcot, where Jane Austen worshipped and where her father was buried, the number of benefices in Bath which are to-day in the hands of Simeon's Trustees is quite exceptional. It is worth remembering also the guiding principle which Simeon laid down for the Trustees' guidance: "Judge how far any parson possesses the qualifications suitable to the particular parish, and by that consideration alone must they be determined in their appointment of him."

I think, however, that Miss Kaye-Smith's conjecture is too narrow. Bath and London gave Jane Austen ample opportunities of hearing and perhaps knowing, some of the best clergymen of her time; more than once she writes of going to church twice on a Sunday, morning and afternoon; and the "seriousness" which marked the Evangelical clergymen in particular seems to me to underlie her own portrayals of the clergy in her novels, not least when they are toadies like Mr Collins or egregious like Mr Elton (who was unlucky enough "to be in the same room at once with the woman he had just married, the woman he had wanted to marry, and the woman he had been expected to marry"). A more complex case is that of Edward Ferrars in *Sense and Sensibility*. Here was an acute case of conscience arising from the fact that he had let himself get engaged at the age of nineteen to the designing Lucy Steele. The dilemma was resolved by the fickle girl being carried off by Edward's brother. But Edward is not only a serious but a tortured man. "Gaiety was never a part of *my* character", he said to Elinor. Yet at the end we find him offered a good living by Colonel Brandon, promised £250 a year by his mother, ordained as he had always wished to be, and happily married in his parsonage at Delaford to Elinor Dashwood. "If Edward might be judged from the ready discharge of his duties in every particular, from an increasing attachment to his wife and his home, and from the regular cheerfulness of his spirits, he might be supposed" to be wholly contented with his lot. Notice the order of the symptoms: his work comes first.

In this her earliest novel, published in 1811 though begun in 1797 when she was only twenty-two, Jane Austen showed herself a real adept at what is called "Moral Theology"—though I suspect she would have shrunk from the term. She knew, as Shakespeare knew, that comedy could be the vehicle of moral truths; indeed, I could wish that her novels might be added to those more learned tomes which candidates for the Ministry have to read. I cannot find any contrast, so far as this element of "seriousness" is concerned, between *Sense and Sensibility*, and *Mansfield Park*. What we do find is two features which distinguish the later book. First of all, there is the unique concentration upon the lives and manners of certain clergymen, especially upon Edmund Bertram. From the moment when Edmund, home from Eton for the holidays, then aged sixteen, found his little ten-year-old cousin, Fanny Price, "sitting crying on the stairs", and showed her an understanding, a kindness, and an affection, to which she had been a stranger since she left her Portsmouth home—from that moment until the end of the book when he had been ordained and he and Fanny were married, Edmund is the unquestioned hero of the story. That, I imagine, is what Jane Austen meant when she wrote to Cassandra on 29 January 1813, "Now I will try to write of something else, and it shall be a complete change of subject—ordination." She is contrasting it with what she calls "my own darling child", namely *Pride and Prejudice*, a copy of which had reached her only two days before. And the theme of the book is completely different.

But so, too, is its scope and its dramatic power; and perhaps that is why Cassandra preferred it to both *Emma* and *Pride and Prejudice*. In no other book does she give us such insight into the doings of the Navy; of one long outpouring by Fanny Price's father Jane Austen's two sailor brothers said that her "seamanship was faultless". Equally striking, and reminding one of Dickens himself, are the chapters which describe the Prices' house in Portsmouth, its squalor, its disorder, its incessant noise. The only redeeming feature was Sunday, when the whole family put on its Sunday best to go to the Garrison Church and afterwards to the ramparts to see what was afoot on the water. This description of how the poor lived reads as though it were based on first-hand knowledge. One wonders how and where our authoress acquired it.

Dramatically, too, *Mansfield Park* stands alone. There is the play, within the play, for example, *Lovers' Vows*. Edmund's objection to

this taking place has been adduced as an argument in favour of the notion that Jane Austen had passed under some "outside influence", before she wrote this book, for many Evangelical leaders were opposed to the theatre. But we know that the Austen family much enjoyed private theatricals, and that she herself was a keen playgoer when in London. But I agree with Mrs Jenkins that *Lovers' Vows*, however much it may have been bowdlerized by its English translator, was an unpleasant play. And it was Edmund who put his finger on the point when he distinguished between "good, hardened acting" (that is, the professional stage) and the self-conscious efforts of a party engaged in private theatricals.

But why did Jane Austen introduce this episode of the play? I suggest that her purpose was purely dramatic: Shakespeare had done likewise, when he made Hamlet say:

> The play's the thing
> Wherein I'll catch the conscience of the king.

So in the play in *Mansfield Park* most of the leading characters in the story stand out in vivid light, not least Edmund Bertram. And his conscience is indeed "caught". For, in fact, his character had a tragic flaw—indecision. He opposed the idea of a play in the house altogether; he was sure that his father would not approve of it; he objected to the play selected. Yet, when the time came, he yielded against his better judgement, and against Fanny's too, and consented to take an important part. This flaw in his character occurs again later, when the charms of Mary Crawford nearly carry him away. Thus early does our authoress give us a kind of preview of what is to follow.

Jane Austen's novels are commonly reckoned as comedies; but in this case the comedy is heavily streaked with tragedy. The dividing line between tragedy and comedy in a play is often not easy to decipher. Shakespeare's *Pericles*, for example, is commonly listed among his tragedies. Yet why? The Prince of Tyre, and his wife Thaisa, and their daughter Marina, pass through incredible sufferings and separations and disasters; but in fact they are always rescued, and at the last they are re-united again in happiness and all the villains come to a bad end. Pericles, again, is strictly speaking not a tragic hero, because he is without any fatal flaw in character such as in Othello, Hamlet, and Lear. I reckon that *Mansfield Park* is much nearer to tragedy than Shakespeare's *Pericles*. On any

showing, Henry Crawford's seduction of Mrs Rushworth was an offence against morality, a plain breach of the Seventh Commandment; and Julia's simultaneous elopement with Mr Yates was an offence against manners, or in other words, convention. All those who were concerned with the private theatricals appear again, though now in misery, humiliation, and disgrace. But they are not all smitten in the same way nor look at things in the same light. Sir Thomas Bertram felt "the guilt and infamy" of Maria Rushworth's adultery, and, upright man as he was, could distinguish between the sin and vice (the words are his own) of her conduct, and the folly of her sister Julia's; and he blamed himself for not having given more attention to the upbringing and education of his daughters. Mrs Norris, at first quieted and stupefied by the news, quickly discovered the scapegoat: "Had Fanny accepted Mr Crawford this could not have happened." Mary Crawford, on the other hand, in her last interview with Edmund could see nothing in it but "folly". "No harsher name than folly given! So voluntarily, so freely, so coolly, to canvass it! No reluctance, no horror, no feminine, shall I say, no modest loathings? This is what the world does. For where, Fanny, shall we find a woman whom nature had so richly endowed? Spoiled, spoiled!" This is how Edmund described it to his cousin.

Then follows the "tidying-up" which concludes all Jane Austen's novels. Maria's liaison with Henry Crawford lasted only six months; they became "each other's punishment" and agreed to separate. Maria went to live with Mrs Norris "in another country, remote and private" where "it may be reasonably be supposed that their tempers became their mutual punishment": but at least "Mrs. Norris's removal from Mansfield was the great supplementary comfort of Sir Thomas's life". We do not know what became of Henry Crawford, nor does it matter. His sister, Mary, on the other hand, does matter; for she had a culture and wit, a capacity for kindness, and a candour, which sometimes remind us of Elizabeth Bennett. But she had no principles. Her outlook was secular, worldly, and frankly cynical about religion. Despite her openly expressed contempt for the clergy, she became genuinely in love with Edmund; and though he realized that their principles differed, Mary never did. She was also really fond of her sister and brother-in-law, the Grants; and his appointment to a Canonry at Westminster came in

the nick of time to make it possible for them to offer her a permanent home in London. One may hope that she found a husband after all.

Meanwhile we are left with Edmund and Fanny; a much chastened Edmund, who had seen how near his blindness and indecision had led him to a disastrous marriage, and Fanny, whose whole life had been so full of chastening that she now had little except joy to look forward to. Lovers of *Mansfield Park* tend to set their hearts on Fanny Price; and hers is indeed a beautiful character. Shy, diffident, humble, and infinitely unselfish, she has firm Christian principles to which she adheres with rock-like consistency; and she has also fire. In the soliloquy which Jane Austen puts in her mouth after reading one of Edmund's letters of indecision, Fanny's fire breaks into flame. "Finish it at once. Let there be an end of this suspense. Fix, commit, condemn yourself!" One can be sure that Fanny made not only an excellent parson's wife, but also that she filled in the fatal deficiency in Edmund's character, so that they could do together what he could never have done by himself.

For Edmund, who is the hero in the novel, had principles too; the same Church principles and ideals which Fanny had, and he could stand up for them with conviction. It is sometimes said that Edmund was a prig. But I do not see him in that light. The revealing scene in the private chapel (now unused for a generation) in the great house at Soberton; the sarcastic remarks of Mary Crawford's that "in those days—the parsons were very inferior to what they are now", a remark for which she apologizes a little later on discovering that Edmund was to be ordained, lead on to a conversation in the grounds outside when Edmund's motive and vocation to ordination are set out with a sustained warmth and conviction, sometimes rising to indignation, which I feel sure are Jane Austen's own. His reasons for wishing to be ordained are carefully given; his insistence that a clergyman should expect a competence to live on; his admission that *some* clergymen have unworthy motives and are indolent and his claim that this was no ground for accusing *all*, all these show the depth and sincerity of his mind. And we gather later not only from the cynical comments and proposals of Mary Crawford and her brother but also from Sir Thomas Bertram's expectations that Edmund intended to reside in his parish. "A parish has wants and claims", says Sir Thomas, "which can be known only

by a clergyman constantly resident"; and Edmund follows a moment later with, "Sir Thomas undoubtedly understands the duties of a parish priest". This is the only place in the novels, I think, where the endearing term "parish priest" is used; and it is significant of Jane Austen's view of Edmund. He may have been dull perhaps, though I am not so sure; but at least he was really good.

I have given this full space to *Mansfield Park* because it seems to me to go to the root of my subject. But there are, of course, others who must be briefly mentioned. The gouty Mr Norris dies very early, leaving a dreadful wife behind him, of whom the less said the better. He was succeeded by Mr Grant who is described as "indolent"; but Mrs Grant, I think, must have been an attractive and kindly woman, able to make of the Mansfield parsonage a real social centre.

We come then to *Northanger Abbey* and the Morlands, father and son, and to Henry Tilney. The father was a "squarson", to use an old phrase, that is, both incumbent and patron of his living; blessed too with some private income of his own, and able to be handsome towards his daughters, but in no other way; not given to wit unless it were a pun, just as his wife preferred a proverb. One flaw alone he had to mar his perfect respectability, and that was given to him at his christening. His name was Richard. His son, James, who was an undergraduate at Oxford, was, I suspect, of his father's type; but as two and a half years must still elapse before he was ordained, it is hard to estimate how good a clergyman he would be. John Thorpe who knew James at Oxford swears that James was "one of the finest fellows in the world"; but as he was making his addresses to Catherine at the time, that was not surprising. Let us hope that there was something in it. According to Isabella, James' favourite colour was purple. But I cannot think that he ever reached it. James Morland and Henry Tilney are alike in this that our authoress's interest in them seems to be as potential husbands for her heroines. Otherwise they differ completely. Henry is a most attractive character; a man of the world in the best sense and fundamentally steady, but enjoying gaiety; a pleasant "tease"; and with sartorial interests which the fair sex often find agreeable. At that time there was little, if anything, to choose between a clergyman and a layman in dress, except in church; the days of Fielding's Parson Adams, who was wearing his cassock when tossed into a ditch, was gone, and that of the dog-collar had not yet

come. Henry always bought his own cravats, and his taste was much admired; and unlike most clergymen, he could give quite a long dissertation on the best muslins for a lady's gown, and where to buy them at least cost. But what of his pastoral duties? One might think that he was so often at Bath or at Northanger that he cannot have been much in his parish at Woodston. Yet in fact he appears to have been normally there for Sundays, and sometimes for a meeting and other duties which kept him for three or four days longer. More decisive than anything, to my mind, is the fact that he kept his dogs there. That meant that Woodston was his home. And I surmise that when he brought his sweet Catherine there too they were both of them so happy that they had no wish to go away from it for long. In that case Mrs Hughes was right when she reported Henry Tilney as "a very fine young man, and likely to do very well".

We pass to *Emma* and Mr Elton. Mr Knightley's sketch of his character in the eighth chapter is borne out in the sequel. Fundamentally Mr Elton is a man "in the make"; and having failed to marry money and position, he contented himself with marrying money and vulgarity. He was already self-satisfied and self-important when he married; and it is clear that, if ever these ambitious fires tended to die down, Mrs Elton would bring her bellows and fan them into flame again. His refusal to dance with Harriet, who was without a partner, shows him to have been selfish too. Moreover, he was handsome and knew it, and was a great favourite wherever he went, not least in church; Miss Nash, indeed, even put down all the texts he had ever preached from since coming to the parish. Mr Knightley was partly ironical when he described Mr Elton as "a very good sort of man, and a very respectable Vicar of Highbury", and Emma was wholly so when she spoke of him as "the standard of perfection in Highbury both in person and mind". But he must have had his points. The occasion when Emma and Harriet met him visiting a poor and suffering family as they came out, and the discussion on how best to help them, is not the only indication in the book of his parish interests. And it was he who officiated at the wedding of the two who had read his character so well. That cataclysm of repentance which pervades the last eight chapters of *Emma*, in which Jane Austen makes the great words penitence, contrition, and forgiveness ring out so plainly, had swept into its stream all that "small band of true

friends who witnessed the ceremony"—Harriet and Frank Churchill and Jane Fairfax as well as the bride and bridegroom themselves; and I like to think that the Vicar's inability to tell his wife what everyone was wearing was due to the fact that he too had felt something of the spirit that was there.

Finally there is *Persuasion* and its two parsons. Mr Charles Hayter lived with his father, six miles away from his curacy; he was good-natured and cultivated; he had hopes "of getting something from the Bishop in the course of a year or two"; and he was certainly not of a practical turn of mind. However, he married his cousin, Henrietta Musgrove. Let us leave it at that. There lived close by a clergyman of very different mettle. Of all Jane Austen's clergymen, I think that Dr Shirley, Rector of Uppercross "who for more than forty years had been zealously discharging all the duties of his office" is the one whom Jane Austen herself held in highest affection and esteem. "Dr. and Mrs. Shirley, who have been doing good all their lives"—could he not be persuaded to go and live seventeen miles away at Lyme Regis? Probably not, because "he is so strict and scrupulous in his notions". Many years ago I knew such a country parson, though he had been sixty years, not forty, in his parish. He was at Rugby under Dr Arnold; and he was then over ninety. As I reached his Rectory, he was just back from a sick visit to a farmer, a mile and a half away on the downs. He had christened and married the majority of his parishioners, and throughout had taught the children in day-school as well as Sunday School. Eventually his family prevailed on him to retire. But let no-one underestimate the value of the continuous witness of such a country parson and his home. None knew it better than the father of English poetry, who has sometimes been called also the father of the English novel, Geoffrey Chaucer.

> Yet he neglected not in rain or thunder,
> In sickness or in grief to pay a call
> On the remotest whether great or small.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> He stayed at home and watched over his fold
> So that no wolf should make the sheep miscarry.
> He was a shepherd and no mercenary.
> Holy and virtuous he was, but then
> Never contemptuous of sinful men,
> Never disdainful, never proud or fine,

But was discreet in teaching and benign.

. . . . . .

Christ and His Twelve Apostles and their lore
He taught, but followed it himself before.

FIVE POETS ON RELIGION
2. COWPER AND BLAKE

ARTHUR POLLARD

BISHOP Butler met John Wesley once, and on that occasion he told him that "the pretending to extraordinary revelations and gifts of the Holy Ghost is a horrid thing—a very horrid thing".[1] Butler died, believing that Christianity could not long survive. His kind of Christianity did not; but Wesley's was only just coming to life. Young, a man of the old world, was influenced by the new. He is said to have become, as he grew older, "religious, even to enthusiasm".[2]

For Butler and his age intellectual conviction and moral integrity formed much the greater part of religion; there was no new thing under the sun. For Wesley every living soul was a new thing, wanted by God. Young had emphasized redemption, Christ's death for mankind. Wesley stressed the corollary, the need for man to respond to redemption, God's offer of salvation. This response came only by the grace of God through divine illumination, God thereby stimulating man to respond. Dr Johnson, believing "enthusiasm" to be a "vain belief of private revelation", would have placed such a response in the enthusiastic category. Wesley was not disturbed by such opinions. "Do you mean", he said in 1761, "who maintains the antiquated doctrine of the new birth, and of justification by faith? Then I am an enthusiast." And within the terms of this definition so was William Cowper.

Like most Evangelicals, Cowper could trace his own conversion to a particular time and place—the time, 1763; the place, Dr Cotton's asylum where he was recovering from his first attack of insanity. Of that life-changing spiritual experience he wrote:

> I was a stricken deer, that left the herd
> Long since. With many an arrow deep infix'd
> My panting side was charg'd, when I withdrew
> To seek a tranquil death in distant shades.
> There was I found by one who had himself
> Been hurt by th' archers. In his side he bore,
> And in his hands and feet, the cruel scars.
> With gentle force soliciting the darts,
> He drew them forth, and heal'd, and bade me live.
> (*The Task*, III. 108-16)

Not since George Herbert had any poet written quite like this about Christ. The simple details of his sufferings show how deeply Cowper apprehended our Lord's Passion. There is, too, the sense of Christ's profound understanding of human need. This appreciation is the product of that personal encounter with the redeeming Saviour, of which Evangelicalism makes so much.

Through that encounter salvation is complete in a moment, by the work of all-sufficient grace. This "makes the slave a freeman",[3] works, or virtue, have no part. This contrast of effectual grace and ineffectual nature, so Monsignor Ronald Knox tells us,[4] is an especial characteristic of enthusiasm. The view is well illustrated from Cowper's work in part of the imaginary dialogue of *Truth*:

> Grant her [i.e. the soul] indebted to what zealots call
> Grace undeserved, yet surely not for all—
> Some beams of rectitude she yet displays,
> Some love of virtue and some pow'r of praise . . . .
> Perish the virtue as it ought, abhorr'd,
> And the fool with it, who insults his Lord.
> Th' Atonement, a Redeemer's love has wrought,
> Is not for you—the righteous need it not.
> (483-6, 503-6)

This attitude the opponents of enthusiasm stigmatized as antinomian. John Langhorne, for example, in his *Letters on Religious Retirement, Melancholy and Enthusiasm* (1772) declared that "it depreciates virtue and consequently hurts the cause of religion". Perhaps the evangelical doctrine of salvation might encourage antinomianism, but the lives of evangelicals certainly contradicted any such expectation. Their moral fervour was one of their most admirable qualities. "The only amaranthine flower on earth Is virtue", Cowper wrote,[5] because

> The Cross once seen is death to ev'ry vice:
> Else he that hang there suffer'd all his pain,
> Bled, groan'd, and agonis'd, and died, in vain.
> (*The Progress of Error*, 622-4)

The virtuous life represents not only faithfulness to Christ in his death, but also progress in sanctification. Life is "an intrusted talent":

> Plac'd for his trial on this bustling stage,
> From thoughtless youth to ruminating age,
> Free in his will to choose or to refuse,
> Man may improve his talent, or abuse.
>
> (Ibid., 23-6)

To help him in his trial, man possesses "divine authority within his breast", which

> Brings every thought, word, action to the test;
> Warns him or prompts, approves him or restrains,
> As Reason, or as Passion, takes the reins.
> Heav'n from above, and Conscience from within,
> Cries in his startled ear—Abstain from sin!
>
> (Ibid., 33-8)

The moral impetus of the Evangelicals derived from their highly developed sense of the individual's responsibility to the will of God; and also from an intense belief in his omnipresence and omnipotence. They resolved

> all events, with their effects
> And manifold results, into the will
> And arbitration wise of the Supreme.
>
> (*The Task*, II. 163-5)

Out of this attitude proceeded their humanitarian concern and their zeal for moral reform in all classes of society. Cowper repeatedly attacked the standards of public behaviour in his time, not, one must admit, always convincingly. Too often he condemns on the basis of report, and probably biassed report at that. It is then, as Mr Norman Nicholson has noted,[6] that his "words are as shrill and hollow as those of the president of the village Mothers' Union condemning the night life of London". But even the incredible virulence springs from a religious virtue. He condemned so strongly, not because the vice was great (he believed it was, but he had really no idea of its size), but because, whatever its magnitude, it was an attempt to thwart, or at least ignore, the all-pervading will of God. It was a foolish, because inevitably doomed, attempt. God *will* be obeyed, and, if he is not, he will punish with Old Testament rigour:

> Providence himself will intervene
> To throw his dark displeasure o'er the scene.
> All are his instruments; each form of war,
> What burns at home, or threatens from afar,

Nature in arms, her elements at strife,
The storms that overset the joys of life,
Are but his rods to scourge a guilty land,
And waste it at the bidding of his hand.
(*Table Talk*, 444-51)

This, like other beliefs of the Evangelicals, no doubt took its intensity from the extreme literalism with which they interpreted the Bible. These were the days before Higher Criticism, but, though all accepted the Bible as a fully inspired, God-given book, no one else gave it that authority and reverence which the Evangelicals bestowed upon it. They were the people of a book. Always the appeal is to Scripture:

Spread the page of Scripture, and compare
Our conduct with the laws engraven there.
(*Retirement*, 131-2)

and certainly under its guidance the best of them were sound in doctrine and holy in life. But their individualism was always potentially dangerous. With every man his own interpreter, anything might happen, and sometimes it did.

Reason still, unless divinely taught,
Whate'er she learns, learns nothing as she ought.
(*Charity*, 337-8)

The result was private interpretation, such as that of Cowper's own cousin, Martin Madan, who wrote a book in which he claimed Scriptural authority for the practice of polygamy. Cowper was outraged; and he was probably not unmindful of Madan when he wrote:

No wild enthusiast ever yet could rest,
Till half mankind were like himself possess'd . . .
Church quacks, with passions under no command,
Who fill the world with doctrines contraband;
Discov'rers of they know not what, confin'd
Within no bounds—the blind that lead the blind.
(*The Progress of Error*, 470-1, 474-7)

This passage, incidentally, shows a regard for the catholic truths of the Church, with which the eighteenth-century Evangelicals are not always credited.

A word must be said about Cowper as a poet of nature. He believed that "God made the country, man made the town", a statement implying a standard of values to which none of the poets mentioned previously in this article would, I think, have subscribed. In the country Cowper felt, amid a fallen creation,

> Traces of Eden are still seen below,
> Where mountain, river, forest, field and grove,
> Remind him of his Maker's pow'r and love.
> (*Retirement*, 28-30)

But the joy of such sights was only for the regenerate:

> Acquaint thyself with God, if thou wouldst taste
> His works. Admitted once to his embrace,
> Thou shalt perceive that thou wast blind before.
> (*The Task*, V. 779-81)

Not for Cowper the way to God through the works of God:

> God never meant that man should scale the heav'ns
> By strides of human wisdom, in his works,
> Though wondrous: he commands us in his word
> To seek him rather where his mercy shines.
> (Ibid., III. 221-4)

Young inverted Pope's belief in the love of man as leading to the love of God; now Cowper has overturned Pope's theory of looking "through Nature up to Nature's God".[7] Both Young and Cowper believed that a more intimate relationship between man and God was possible than Pope dared to contemplate.

For Cowper (and for Evangelicals generally) this sense of intimacy was such that they lived in a constant, acute awareness that God touched life at all points, their own lives, the life of nature, and the life of society. God is always present and active; and as a result the individual is always living his life under trial. This sense of trial, of being under judgement, is, however, linked with the sense of complete dependence on the same God who judges. The Evangelical is at once taut and relaxed, tried but assured. Out of just such tension there comes Cowper's devotional zeal and moral fervour, the confidence which so often seems to conflict with our knowledge of his natural temperament and, be it said, the stridency that sometimes issues from over-confidence. But he had the certainty which came from grace-given intuitive grasp of

eternal truths. Above all, he knew—with Young—that Christ had died to save the world from sin, but, more explicitly and in more sustained manner than Young, he gloried in the belief that Christ had died to save him, William Cowper, from his sins. I have quoted widely from Cowper's poems, because I think this belief and those others which issued from it uniformly pervade and inform all his work. The intensity of an unshakeable faith, whole-hearted assurance, a passionate apprehension of man's experience of God—these we find wherever we look in Cowper's work.

The Evangelicals were orthodox in doctrine; it was the way they arrived at conviction which caused their contemporaries to label them as enthusiasts. Blake's enthusiasm went further than this. Orthodoxy horrified him:

> I went to the Garden of Love,
> And saw what I had never seen:
> A Chapel was built in the midst,
> Where I used to play on the green.
>
> And the gates of this Chapel were shut,
> And 'Thou shalt not' writ over the door;
> So I turn'd to the Garden of Love
> That so many sweet flowers bore;
>
> And I saw it was filled with graves,
> And tombstones where flowers should be;
> And priests in black gowns were walking their rounds,
> And binding with briars my joys and desires.
>
> (*Songs of Experience*)

For Blake, the God of established religion was old Nobodaddy, a god of prohibitions; and in the poem quoted above ecclesiastical authority is restrictive, negative; whereas the love symbolism, probably sexual, is free, active, and positive. The very simplicity of the opposition shows how complete and uncompromising it is.

Blake could not accept, he must create, a system:

> I must create a System or be enslaved by another Man's.
> I will not Reason and Compare: my business is to create.
>
> (*Jerusalem*, Chap. I, Plate 10, lines 20-1, p. 629[8])

The esoteric symbolism of the later works, capable of divergent interpretations, is the mark of Blake's success in this resolve. I do not intend to try to add another exegesis of the Blakean scheme, but merely to make a few remarks, which seem relevant to the theme of this article, on the quality of Blake's faith and ethic.

The intimacy between God and man which we have noticed in Cowper becomes a coalescence, a kind of divine humanity, in Blake. "God becomes as we are that we may be as He is."[9] To participate in this divine humanity, the gift of special insight is required: "He who sees the Infinite in all things sees God. He who sees the Ratio only, sees himself only."[10] That special insight is Imagination, or the True Poetic Genius. "The Eternal Body of Man is The Imagination, that is, God Himself, the Divine Body, Jesus, we are His members",[11] and again "Imagination is the Divine Body in Every Man".[12] Imagination seems to be both the means of perception and the thing perceived.

It is certainly living and creative, in contrast with the Ratio, a form of Reason, which is confined to arguing from what is already known. Reason

> When separated
> From Imagination and closing itself as in steel
> in a Ratio
> Of the things of Memory, It thence frames Laws
> and Moralities
> To destroy Imagination, the Divine Body.
> (*Jerusalem*, Chap. 3, Plate 74,
> lines 10-13, p. 714)

Destructive of imagination, the Ratio is that form of Reason associated with the names of Bacon, Newton, and Locke and by which Blake considered that his own age was dominated:

(True) Reason says 'Miracle': Newton says 'Doubt'.

> Aye! that's the way to make all Nature out.
> 'Doubt, doubt, and don't believe without experiment':
> That's the very thing that Jesus meant,
> When he said 'Only believe! believe and try!
> Try, try, and never mind the reason why.'
> (Epigrams, Verses, and Fragments from the
> Note Book (c. 1808-11) p. 21—Nonesuch
> ed., p. 536)

The heavy irony shows with what contempt he regarded this "scientific rationalism" of his time. Faith is imagination at work, trust in the underlying reason of things.

Perverted reason destroys not only faith, Blake believed, but also what he considered to be the true morality, that of impulse. "Those who restrain Desire, do so because theirs is weak enough to be restrained; and the restrainer or Reason usurps its place and governs the unwilling."[13] At its best, impulse expresses the divine humanity in its moral aspects:

> Mercy, Pity, Peace and Love
> Is God our Father dear,
> And Mercy, Pity, Peace and Love
> Is man, his child and care.
>
> For Mercy has a human heart,
> Pity a human face,
> And Love, the human form divine,
> And Peace, the human dress.
>
> (The Divine Image 5-12,
> *Songs of Innocence*)

"Love, the human form divine" is the central phrase. The simple, spontaneous quality of these lines is itself a mark of Blake's passion on this subject. Man being created in the divine image, human brotherhood represents the most sacred relationship possible, and regard for it is man's highest moral obligation:

> Jesus said: 'Wouldest thou love one who never died
> 'For thee, or ever die for one who had not died for
> thee?
> 'And if God dieth not for Man and giveth not himself
> 'Eternally for Man, Man could not exist; for Man is
> Love
> 'As God is Love: every kindness to another is a
> Little Death
> 'In the Divine Image, nor can Man exist but by
> Brotherhood'
>
> (*Jerusalem*, Plate 96, lines 23-28,
> p. 743)

This is morality in the highest Christian pattern.

Indeed so impressive does this part of his system seem to have been that Blake was blind to the need for restraint as an essential part of his ethic. "Moral virtues", he said,

> all begin
> In the Accusations of Sin.
> (Supplementary passage 2 to *The Everlasting Gospel*, 33-4, p. 759)

They are loathsome and unnecessary. "There is not one Moral Virtue that Jesus Inculcated but Plato and Cicero did Inculcate before Him? Forgiveness of Sins. This alone is the Gospel."[14] The "moral virtues" are unnecessary, because the way to deal with sin is to forgive it, and by forgiving it to be faithful to the brotherhood of divine humanity.

It is a magnificent moral vision, but it could only suit one man. Blake recognized his difference from others:

> The Vision of Christ that thou dost see
> Is my Vision's Greatest Enemy . . .
> Both read the Bible day and night,
> But thou readst black where I read white.
> (From the Note Book (c. 1818), p. 33, Fragment a, lines 1-2, 13-14, p. 748)

It could not be otherwise, because the status of imagination in his system made him ultra-subjective, enthusiastic to the last degree. Professor Fairchild has admirably summed up the ultimate position: "Man is saved by man, imagination is saved by imagination, William Blake is saved by William Blake."[15]

I have referred thus briefly to Blake to show enthusiasm in its final phase. It may be objected that a man of such individual genius might arise at any time in history. That may well be true. I prefer, however, to accept Mr Eliot's explanation of Blake's position: "What his genius required, and what it sadly lacked, was a framework of accepted and traditional ideas which would have prevented him from indulging in a philosophy of his own . . . . The fault is perhaps not with Blake himself, but with the environment which failed to provide what such a poet needed."[16]

I think, however, that the ideas were there. There was a theology, but it had lost its compelling authority, its ability to fire men's imaginations. It is not insignificant that Young, probably the

soundest theologian in the group I have treated, was also the dullest poet. To compensate for this failure to be impressed by the whole gospel, men took to partiality, to inordinate stress upon some few aspects. This fault appears in both the rationalist emphasis on morality, the virtuous life, and the enthusiastic on salvation by grace. Those who could not be content with partiality had to work out systems of their own. Pope and Blake did this, but in the event, and inevitably, their systems were partial, too—excellent morally, inadequate theologically. Throughout the period under review a satisfactory idea of God only rarely came to light. The rationalists failed to find him, and ended content to infer what they thought his will to be; the enthusiasts saw God, but sometimes with distorted vision. None seemed able to apprehend at once both fully and clearly. Perhaps of them all, the evangelicals came nearest to achieving this. The radical fault was, I believe, that too much eighteenth-century religion was anthropocentric rather than theocentric. Too often it was man's conduct, man's salvation; not often enough, God's glory, that mattered. There was a response, but it was the response of inadequate or misguided aspiration.

1 *Journal of John Wesley*, 16 and 18 August, 1739.
2 Benjamin Victor, *Original Letters*, 1776, 3 vols., p. 266—Letter to Richard Griffith.
3 *The Task V*, 688. 4 *Enthusiasm*, 1950, p. 3.
5 *The Task* III, 268-9. 6 *William Cowper*, 1951, p. 49.
7 *Essay on Man*, IV. 332.
8 This page reference, like those that follow, is to the Nonesuch edition, Sir G. Keynes, 1957.
9 *There is no Natural Religion* (Second Series), Application, p. 98.
10 Ibid. 11 *Laocoon*, p. 776.
12 Marginalia to Berkeley's *Siris*, p. 234—Nonesuch ed., p. 773.
13 *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell*, Plates 5-6, p. 149.
14 Supplementary Passage to the *Everlasting Gospel*, p. 757.
15 *Religious Trends in English Poetry* (1949), III. 111.
16 *Selected Essays* (1932), p. 322.

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE PASSION AND THE QUMRAN CALENDAR

C. S. MANN, O.S.B.

The reader should be warned that since this article was written, some months ago, there has been a spate of articles on the subject. This article does not attempt more than to give an outline of the theory which has caused much subsequent discussion.

THE SECTARIAN literature of Qumran is being assiduously courted by more than one interest, and the period of the espousals (or proposals!) looks like being indefinitely prolonged. Recently, however, there has been a suggestion made that the calendar-system in use among the sectarians has something to say on the very vexed question of the chronology of the Passion, and may even provide the *Sitz im Leben* for the Lord's celebration of the Supper. By this means, so it is alleged, we may have the best of both worlds, the synoptic and the Johannine, and at one stroke of the pen from the Qumran scriptorium settle all the ills which have attended the enquiry: Was the Last Supper a Passover, or not?

There is already a considerable amount of writing on the Qumran calendar, and we are promised more in the future. The leading luminary in the discussion has so far been the French scholar Madame Jaubert, and from her hands there are several contributions.[1] She was anticipated some years ago by the distinguished Dominican, Père Lagrange, in asserting that the Last Supper was not kept according to an official calendar.[2] Vogt, Delorme, Schwank, Obermann, and Morgenstern have all written from one angle or another on this topic, and Professor Driver is said to be engaged on a similar task.[3]

Basically, the suggestion is simple, though there are some difficulties attaching to it which have, perhaps, not had the attention which they merit—and of the difficulties it is proposed to say something later on. The thesis, or hypothesis, is as follows: The old, solar, calendar in use in Jubilees, Enoch, and some parts of the Old Testament, may have provided the usage of Jesus and the Twelve at the Last Supper, and the sectarians of Qumran are now known to have used that calendar, beyond any shadow of doubt. There was, therefore, a living tradition in Judaea of a usage which owed nothing to the official temple calendar. The evidence for the

Qumran usage is very conveniently set out in a work by Fr Milik, and now available in English.[4] From his examination of the material in Cave 4, Fr Milik comes to the conclusion that the Passover at Qumran was held on a fixed day—Tuesday. Similarly, Vogt deals with the same data[5] and attempts a reconstruction of the calendar. He comes to the conclusion that if we allow a three-year cycle for the official lunar calendar of Jerusalem, with a one-day-plus reminder, this adjustment will bring the official Passover in the fourth year into the same week as the sectarian celebration, but one day later. Now the Essene Passover falls on a Tuesday, as we have seen, and so we arrive at the interesting conclusion that in the first year the official Passover would fall on a Wednesday night, on Thursday in the fourth year, and on Friday in the seventh. On Vogt's submission, the data which we have in the gospels will fit in with the calendar of the seventh year. If this should prove to be indeed the case, then Mme Jaubert's hypothesis stands. The official calendar of Jerusalem was in the hands of the clergy and was of necessity subject to the attentions of intercalation; and this kind of variation, coupled with the fixed Passover of Qumran in the old solar calendar, would appear to have something of importance to say on the matter of the timing of events in Passion week. Our sources as they stand simply do not agree, and it is usual to pass over in discreet silence the enormous difficulties attendant upon any attempt to make a consistent time-table of all the events in all four gospels.

Here, then, is Vogt's own reconstruction of the chronology on the assumption that the Lord and the Twelve were not observing the official calendar. The note of time at John 12. 1 (the anointing at Bethany six days before the Passover) is a note of the official calendar which John observes—or rather records—all through. The Entry is placed on the following day, which is Sunday. The cursing of the tree (Mark 11. 12) will therefore be Monday, and the discovery of its dying state on the third day, Tuesday (Mark 11. 20). The council meets, the synoptists noting that the Passover was after two days, John's official note declaring that it was drawing near. Judas at the same time goes to the temple clergy. Now, according to the synoptists, Jesus kept the Passover on the first day of unleavened bread, and in both Matthew and Mark the interval between this and the council of priests is very brief. Then comes the accusation before Annas, and the denial of Peter, and Jesus is led to

Caiaphas and there spends the night. In the daylight, Luke tells us, the elders assembled, and took him to the council, questioned many witnesses, and having mocked him as false Messiah, consigned him to a Jewish prison for the night of Wednesday. Matthew and Mark speak of some scheme to begin a civil action in the morning—and this, on Vogt's view, is best understood to mean Thursday. Having condemned him to death, the authorities had perforce to go to Pilate, who sent Jesus to Herod. He was returned to Pilate, not accompanied this time by Jewish leaders, and spent the night in a Roman prison. On Friday there was the second trial before Pilate, of which John notes the morning hour, and Matthew and Luke call attention to the many witnesses, the priests and the officials. There was time to stir up the rabble, and there was also time, between the two trials, for the dream of Pilate's wife. John puts the sentence at the sixth hour, on Roman reckoning. After the flogging, Jesus is led out to death, at the third hour (Mark) on Jewish reckoning, and the synoptists give the hour of death as the ninth.

The time notes in our gospels are anything but clear, and there is no certainty to be found in them. The first emphatic note that we have in the synoptists is the conspiracy of the leaders two days before the Passover in Mark 14. 1-2 (=Matt. 26. 1-5). And here we meet our first major difficulty. The calendar in use by the evangelist Mark in this instance is without question the *official* calendar, and the day is Tuesday. Now there is no satisfactory answer, on the Jaubert-Vogt theory, to the question: Why did Mark here use the official, Jerusalem, calculation, and then later on revert to the Essene sectarian calendar? Indeed, on the theory which we have been outlining here, confusion is the worse confounded by the fact that Mark uses the sectarian calculation for an event later in the same day—Tuesday. It can be said, in defence of the whole new theory of Passion-week, that with the lapse of time memory faded in the early Church, and the adoption of the official calendar led to confusion of the events, even when the date of the Supper was accurately preserved. This may well be so, but that verse of Mark does represent an obstinate surd in the calculation and will have to have a deal of notice taken of it, if the edifice of Vogt is to stand. Between this note of the machinations of the clerical party, and the visit of Judas to the temple-clergy, there is only the untimed anointing at Bethany, and with Mark 14. 12 (=Matt. 26. 17=Luke 22. 7) the time of the Passover has come. Apart from the difficulties raised

by the verse which we have considered, the thesis of Vogt fits the events of the Passion far better than anything else which we have heard lately.

We are not very happy, most of us, in our treatment of the last things of the Passion story, and in homiletics at all events we tend to slur over the very real fever of activity which—on the traditional view—has to be crowded into some twelve hours or less. We tend to gloss over the manifest welter of happenings which have to be placed in the few hours of Thursday night—Friday morning, assuming that the Lord kept Passover on the traditional day. And we do not half reckon with the Jewish evidence that trials might not take place at night if they involved a possible death-sentence. Customarily, we make the plea that the evangelists have been at the familiar scissors-and-paste game, or that so many things have been misplaced or mislaid in the chain of events. At all events, on the Jaubert-Vogt theory, we are delivered from the haste and the turmoil which is the impression given by the traditional timing. There is no impression of haste in the gospels—quite the contrary. The Upper Room—the more so if Johannine evidence is here admissible—gives no room to us to suppose that there was any urgency, nor does the scene in the Garden.[6]

If we assume that the first appearance of Jesus before the Sanhedrin was late, then here again there is no indication that the high priest was impatient at the mere consideration of time—simply that the evidence was so unsatisfactory. Peter's denial, which the gospels place here, would then serve as an indication that there was an adjournment at daybreak. Here Mark 15. 1 and the parallels agree, for it is light when Jesus is led to Pilate. At this point, Vogt sees in the Markan and Lukan references to the Sanhedrin evidence a proof that the trial took place on Wednesday morning after daybreak—but his further suggestion that Matt. 27. 1 posits a second trial is not so easy to follow, and there is no evidence that the appearance before the Procurator followed hot-foot on the meeting of the Sanhedrin. Events do appear to follow upon one another before the end of the day, but this, too, is not easy to accept.

Luke's report of a trial before Herod is dealt with satisfactorily on the Vogt thesis, for Luke 23. 13 tells us that Pilate assembled the rulers and the people before the events which led to his acceptance of the death-sentence. It is true that there is no hint that this second

trial took place on the day after the first trial, but once accept it, and the traditional chronology—into which Luke fits but ill—loses its appearance of haste at this point. It is, as has already been asserted, much easier to account for the dream of Pilate's wife if a day intervened.

The Fourth Gospel offers quite other problems. Plainly, in that gospel the Passover was being inaugurated at the time of the death of Jesus on the cross, and on that score the Last Supper cannot have been a Passover-meal.[7] The chronology of the Fourth Gospel is all very bewildering. The very ill-defined entry into the city is placed on the day following a meal at Bethany which is said to have happened six days before the Passover. If the Passover happened on the seventh day, which is implied clearly by 19. 31, then the Supper must have been on the first day, and the entry on the Monday. We can hardly envisage the Supper on the Sabbath. All this fits the synoptists very ill. After the entry, Jesus retires, and the notice of the Supper at 13. 1 merely whets the appetite for more information by saying "before the feast of the Passover"—and that could have meant Tuesday of the Jaubert-Vogt theory. The trial in John is no more involved or complicated than in the synoptists, and there has been a deal of compression. Certainly there is more space given to the Roman court, and the verdict is given at six o'clock on the morning of Friday (19. 14).

If we say—and it may be all that we are entitled to say at this stage—that there is a minimum of difficulty in the way of opting for the Supper on the Tuesday, then we may also plead that there is on that basis far more time for the events which the gospels record of the arrest and the trials of Jesus. We may feel justified in adding that both the Synoptic Gospels and the Fourth Gospel imply that there was a meal which had some connection with the coming feast, and, if we add to that the fact that the first three of our sources agree that it was a Passover meal, and that John allows of our saying that it was not held at the official time, we have said all that can with safety be said. It has to be emphasized that the only firm datum that we have at present is Fr Milik's proof that the sectarians kept Passover on a fixed day, and that day was Tuesday.

There are difficulties attaching to the theory, and some of them will have to be briefly examined here. In the first place, we may share the confidence of Cullmann and others that there was far more connection between early Christianity and fringe-Judaism than our

sources overtly state; but the theological gulf between Qumran and the early Church was immense, in spite of much common vocabulary. To attempt to go beyond this, and make bold assertions about the nature of the Qumran Passover in connection with the Last Supper is a highly tendentious proceeding at this juncture. The two bodies may have had similar ideas about the Messianic banquet —though even that may be open to doubt—but there is not a shred of evidence that the sectarians had any notion that the Messianic expectation was in process of fulfilment. Again, the theory binds us to the conclusion that Jesus and the Twelve used the old solar calendar; but if this was so, then why did the infant Church so soon revert to the official, lunar, calculation? If the solar usage derived from the Lord's Galileean background, it can only be said that the growth of the Church in and around Jerusalem must have compelled the Christians to come to terms with official usage—they could not for ever remain a self-contained enclave. To this must be added the fact that our knowledge of first-century synagogue practice in and around the capital is meagre and unsatisfactory, and there appear to have been twenty or more separate congregations in Jerusalem catering for the various bits and pieces of the Diaspora. In the nature of the case we know nothing of any possible alliance of Christians with one or more of those groups, and of the possible effects such an alliance might have had on calendar practice. The utmost that can be said with safety is that the adoption by the Jerusalem church of the official calculation, plus revived memories of the old solar cycle from written sources, *may* have led to the confusion that there is in the gospels between solar and lunar calculation. But this tentative guess in the end rests upon the assumption that Jaubert and Vogt are right.

To the question: What is to be made of Paul's *ho kurios Iesous en te nukti he paredideto* (1 Cor. 11. 23)?, Mme Jaubert replies that this was in all probability a liturgical formula, and does not mean "the eve of his death"—which we might have expected to be the meaning on the basis of the traditional chronology. It may be felt, however, that here is a difficulty which the new timing does not quite adequately meet, yet if Judas' capitulation to the Temple clergy (Mark 14. 1-2, which has engaged us before) was on the Tuesday, and that Tuesday was the night of the Last Supper, then the Pauline phrase will serve the new theory as well as the old chronology.

It has been asserted that there is no impression of haste about the Lord's last hours with his disciples in the Garden, and the evidence from the Jewish legal standpoint seems to substantiate this. Both Mark and Matthew tell us of the trouble which was taken to secure the agreement of the witnesses at the trial, and this well illustrates the prescriptions of the law in the *Mishnah*: "Yet if they contradict one another, whether during the inquiries or the cross-examination, their evidence becomes invalid." (Sanhedrin 5. 2) This is not the sum of the *Mishnah* evidence which can be brought to bear upon our task. In the same section (Sanhedrin 4. 1) we have: "in capital cases a verdict of acquittal may be reached on the same day, but a verdict of conviction not until the following day." Similarly in Sanhedrin 5. 5: "If they found him innocent they set him free; otherwise they leave his sentence over until the morrow." For this very reason, the *Mishnah* declares that "trials may not be held on the eve of a Sabbath or on the eve of a Festival day". (Sanhedrin 4. 1)[8] If the trial of Jesus was properly constituted and conducted—and there is no hint in the New Testament that it was anything but legal—then here there is striking support for both Vogt and Mme Jaubert.

There is some oddly-related patristic support for the new theory, though in one case the source does not appear to know what to make of the tradition. Here is the *Didascalia* preserving an old memory that the Passover was, in the year of the Lord's death, kept on a Tuesday by anticipation: "But by reason of the multitudes of all the people, from every city and from all the villages, who were coming up to the temple to keep the Passover in Jerusalem, the priests took counsel and commanded and appointed that they should keep the festival straightway, that they might seize him without disturbance. For the inhabitants of Jerusalem were engaged with the sacrifice and the eating of the Passover; and moreover, all the people that were without were not yet come, for they had deceived them as to the days . . . they anticipated the Passover by three days, and kept it in the eleventh of the moon, on the third day of the week. . . . And so on the night when the fourth day of the week drew on, (Judas) betrayed our Lord to them. But they made the payment to Judas on the tenth of the month, on the second day of the week. . . ."[9] The sense appears to be that the priests had deceived the people by not informing them of an anticipated Passover. But the whole thing is far better explained by

supposing that here we have a dim memory of a tradition in the Church that the Lord had kept the Passover with the Twelve on a Tuesday. As it stands, the *Didascalia* is utterly at variance with the Fourth Gospel, and only on the theory of Vogt and Mme Jaubert can it easily be accommodated to the synoptic gospels. Dom Connolly, in his notes, adds the following quotation from Epiphanius of Salamis: ". . . *ephagon oun to pascha pro duo hemeron tou phagein, toutesti te trite hesperas, hosper edei te pempte hesperas* . . ." and Epiphanius adds that this Tuesday was the eleventh of the moon.[10] We may deplore the fact that Epiphanius was an absentee prelate, and that he spent his time hounding the admirers of Origen's works, but he was so much of the busybody that any stray traditions were likely to come his way in the course of his wanderings. Here is additional support for the Tuesday-Passover theory, but so far nothing which could be called in any way definitive and final. There is nothing, either in Epiphanius or in the *Didascalia*, which does more than keep alive, in a puzzled and rather helpless way, a tradition that somewhere or other there was a Tuesday mixed up in the Passover-saga of the Lord's Passion.[11]

Thus far with Vogt.[12] There are serious objections, however, to the proposed reconstruction of the traditional calendar, and they have been raised in short form both by Père Milik and Père Bénoît.[13] Milik rightly points out that in order to allow any validity to the theory at all, it is necessary to assume a Wednesday sectarian Passover which preceded a Sabbath Passover in the orthodox calendar. This he observes to be probable once in every thirty years or so. Having regard to the notorious difficulty of making any final judgements as to the duration of our Lord's earthly life, or even of arriving at any clues as to its beginning, we are being asked to opt for a coincidental observance which lacks any ultimate precision. The state of our knowledge is such that the option can be held to be very perilous. Again, there is the suggestion implicit in both Mme Jaubert, and in Vogt, that a liturgical practice (and it is known that some Christians did keep a Commemoration of the Last Supper on a Tuesday) has its point of departure in an historical situation. This cannot be readily accepted without challenge. Liturgy is far more apt to colour understandings of history than vice-versa. Again, there are consequences of some gravity to the picture which the gospels present to us of the Lord's regard for the temple and its life and worship.[14] The Fourth Gospel, indeed, appears to hang our Lord's

major discourses on the incidence of the temple cursus—including the Feast of the Dedication, which Qumran does not mention anywhere. We have a picture of the Lord going up to the feasts, mixing with the crowds who thronged the temple-courts, and teaching them without let or hindrance. How far are we to imagine him using one calendar (on one isolated occasion?) for one purpose and another calendar for another? And how far did the use of an unofficial calendar commit a man to a fixed attitude to a sect whose calendar he was using? Is all this tantamount to saying that Jesus was a kind of super-Essene? Your contributor confesses that he is not at all sure how far all this ought to be pressed. It is true that Matthew, the most Jewish of all the gospels, regards the Lord as having a care for the Law and its institutions; yet it is also true that the gospel which gives the discourses a point of departure from the festivals of the Law is also the gospel which demands a rejection of the temple (John 4. 20ff).[15] Perhaps the most that we can say is that we have a case which is "not proven". However, it deserves to be borne in mind that Professor Grant has returned to an attack which B. S. Easton conducted thirty years ago on the identification of Messiah with the Son of David.[16] Grant ventures to think that Jesus repudiated the identification far more emphatically than our sources indicate, and he makes the further point that we have more than a hint from the gospels that the Lord's family was in some manner involved in controversy on this very point in the days when James ruled the Jerusalem church. Here we are on ground which has been trodden before—notably in that attempt to emphasize the essential "Jewishness" of Jesus.

To this catena of exciting speculation there is a further note to be added—and it concerns the Quartodeciman controversy. There have been attempts in plenty to make some kind of sense of the Asiatic celebration of 14 Nisan. Did the Quartodecimans hold that the Resurrection was included in an omnibus-feast of Passover-Passion? We have no record, it is true, that they ever "kept" Easter in the sense in which we of another tradition "keep" the feast. Were they right in claiming an apostolic authority for what they did, and was there a Synoptics-versus-John motif underlying the confusion? Finally, did they (as C. R. Richardson suggested nearly twenty years ago)[17] keep, not the Lord's celebration of his Passover-Passion, but, an all-embracing commemoration of the New Covenant? If they

did, then here is more evidence of a persistent tradition which differs radically from our own received chronology.

There is a final note to be added. It concerns the suggestion of Dr Dodd in his memorable work on the Fourth Gospel that the "Lamb" of John 1. 29, 36 is not a type of Passover-lamb, but rather a Messianic title like "King of Israel", or "bell-wether of the flock" (*pace* Enoch 89ff). Now apart from the fact—which Dodd does not find impressive—that John's whole movement of time-table is towards the Passover at which Jesus was killed, we have—if Vogt is correct—startling testimony to a like concern on the part of all the evangelists. Sectarian calendar or orthodox, all the gospels. on this theory, are at one in making the Lord's self-dedication at the Supper a dedication at the Paschal meal.

Altogether, there are plenty of new eras dawning just now. It remains to be seen—as the late Professor Skinner remarked of some Old Testament scholarship—just how many of them will shine unto the perfect day. No one will deny that these are exciting times in which to live as a student, and we cannot complain that our preceptors are failing us.

1 A. Jaubert, "La Date de la Céne", *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, 146.1954. See also her article in *Vetus Testamentum* 3.1953 and 7.1957, and her monograph in *Etudes Bibliques*. 1957.

2 In his Commentary on Mark and on John. The suggestion was repeated by Mgr Knox in his Commentary on John, hazarding the guess that Passover was kept at a different time by Galileeans. Without the evidence which has now come to hand from Qumran, most of us would have dismissed the suggestion pretty well out of hand.

3 There is a growing volume of literature on the sectarian calendar: D. Barthélemy, *Revue Biblique*. 1952, pp. 199ff; J. Delorme, *Lumière et Vie* 31.1957; B. Schwank, *Benediktinische Monatschrift* 33. 7 & 8.1957. In addition, J. Morgenstern, *Vetus Testmentum* 5.1955, and in the same periodical (7.1957) an article by Segal.

4 *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*, S.C.M., 1958.

5 E. Vogt, "Antiquum Kalendarium Sacerdotale", *Biblica* 6.1955, p. 403ff, and esp. "Dies Ultimae Coenae Domini" pp. 408ff.

6 In this connection, cf. "The Passover Haggadah" in *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, David Daube, University of London, Athlone Press, 1956.

7 There is a recent attempt to deal with the difficulties of varying chronology in S. I. Buse, "S. John and the Markan Passion Narrative", *New Testament Studies* 4.3 1958.

8 Quotations are from H. Danby, *The Mishnah*, O.U.P., 1933.

9 *Didascalia Apostolorum*, ed. R. H. Connolly, O.U.P., 1929, p. 188 (21. 12-15 of the *Did.App.*).

10 Epiphanius, *Haereses* 51. 26. Cf. also *De Fide* 22: "Die 4to Dominus

prehensus est."

[11] Vogt adds at this point the testimony of Victorinus of Pettau (*de Fabrica Mundi*) that Christians begin with the commemoration of the Lord's capture on Wednesday.

[12] The following quotation from Vogt is apposite here: "Primum testimonium coenae liturgicae f.5 commemoratae habetur demum in 2a parte saec. 4 apud *Epiphanium* (fragm. Holl, l.c., p. 161) qui eam reicit; 'Nequaquam f.5 manducavit pascha sed f.3 . . . Ideo ecclesia diem 4um observat propter captivitatem Domini. . . . Noli enim putare die 5to vespere eum comprehensum esse.' Lagrange, Ev. S. Marc, 1942, p. 365, n. 1: 'Traditio Christiana considerabat f.4 ut initium passionis.' "

[13] Cf. Père Bénoît's review of Mme Jaubert's work in *Revue Biblique* 65. 1958.

[14] It ought to be said here that our gospel-sources are not at one on this point!

[15] Cf. here an article by Dr Caldecott: "The Significance of the Cleansing of the Temple", *J.T.S.* 24.96, (o.s.) July 1923.

[16] Cf. *The Gospels*, F. C. Grant, Faber and Faber, 1959, p. 99.

[17] C. R. Richardson, "The Quartodecimans and the Chronology of the Synoptics", *Harvard Theological Review* 33.3. 1940.

[18] C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, C.U.P., 1954, p. 233 ff. There is an excellent summary of this discussion in Alan Richardson, *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament*, S.C.M., 1959, pp. 225ff, and Professor Richardson has done a great service by accumulating in short form the current views on this theme.

WAS ST PAUL A JEWISH MISSIONARY?

HARRY SAWYERR

WHERE was St Paul during our Lord's earthly Ministry in Palestine? This is a question which confronts all serious students of St Paul because of the complete silence of the Apostle on the subject. According to the evidence that is deducible from the Epistles, he does not seem to have seen Jesus at all. The writer of Acts says he was a "young man" when Stephen was put to death (Acts 7. 58). Dean Farrer postulates that this incident probably took place early in A.D. 37. He therefore concludes that the Apostle must have been a younger contemporary of Jesus and was likely to have been born about A.D. 3, and certainly within the same decade as our Lord.[1] Anderson Scott, on the other hand, thinks that the Apostle was probably two or three years older than our Lord, and may have been born in 4 or 5 B.C.[2] It has also been suggested that the boy Saul went to Jerusalem from Tarsus to study under Gamaliel, at the age of about thirteen years.[3] But Anderson Scott thinks that sixteen or eighteen years is a more likely age.[4] If these suggested figures are accurate, one would naturally expect that St Paul must have learnt of our Lord's activities, certainly in Judaea, and quite probably in Galilee, because we learn from St Mark that our Lord had several encounters with Pharisees (2. 23; 3. 6; 8. 11), some of them coming from Jerusalem specially to make contact with him, during the Galilean Ministry (7. 1f). On our Lord's entry into the borders of Judaea, Pharisees also came to ask him about the legality of divorce (10. 2). At Jerusalem, in concert with the Herodians, they ask him whether it is lawful to pay tribute to Caesar (12. 13f).

In any case, St Mark records an occasion when a great multitude followed Jesus, from Galilee, "and from Judaea, and from Jerusalem, and from Idumea, and beyond Jordan, and about Tyre and Sidon, a great multitude . . ." (3. 7f). Reports of our Lord's activities had already been widely disseminated, and had been heard throughout Palestine, even if, as according to St Mark, his Ministry was chiefly in Galilee.

If St Paul was a younger or even near contemporary of Jesus, how is it then that he never once mentioned that he had seen him? The only contact he reports dates from the vision on the Damascus road. The passage "even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now know we Him so no more" (2 Cor. 5. 16), is at first

glance, suggestive of personal contact between the two men. This is the impression one gets from the language used in the American Revised Standard Version and in Phillips' *Letters to the Younger Churches*. In these translations, the Greek phrase *kata sarka* is rendered "from a human point of view" and "as a man" respectively. But the phrase seems capable of other interpretations. Thus Prat suggests that it implies "after the manner of the enemies of Paul . . ."[5] Prat dismisses the suggestion that St Paul had known Jesus personally but now wishes to forget about that experience as unacceptable.[6] Conybeare and Howson translate the phrase "carnally". They also deny that St Paul refers to any actual knowledge of our Lord and say "St Paul's view of Christ was carnal when he looked (like other Jews) for a Messiah who should be an earthly conqueror".[7] Rawlinson also points out that there is no suggestion of a contrast between the Jesus of the flesh and the Jesus of the Spirit. "For St Paul there is only one Christ—Jesus of Nazareth. What he is repudiating is not a fleshly kind of Christ but a fleshly kind of knowledge."[8] Bultmann also suggests that the correct interpretation of the passage depends on whether or not the phrase *kata sarka* in the verse modifies the objects or the verbs."[9]

We must admit of course that no categorical deductions one way or the other can be based on this silence. At the same time, it is most probably true to say that for a man of St Paul's nature, and in his position, some reference would have been made to any personal human contact with Jesus if there had been one. We might more confidently state that had St Paul witnessed the crucifixion, mention would have been made of that epoch-making event in his writings. Conybeare and Howson remark that "it is hardly conceivable that if he had been at Jerusalem during our Lord's public ministration there, he should never allude to it".[10] Where then was he?

Dean Farrer writing in 1879, suggested that Saul the Pharisee may have been absent from Jerusalem on some missionary journeys abroad "during the brief visits to Jerusalem which marked the three years' ministry of Christ on earth".[11] Conybeare and Howson mention two other suggestions: (*a*) by Baron Benson that Saul the Pharisee "was a young student during our Lord's ministry"; (*b*) by Lardner, that "the restraint and retirement of a student might have kept him ignorant of what was going on in the world".[12]

But it seems more likely that St Paul was not so young a student during our Lord's activities in Jerusalem as not to have been able

to recall ever seeing him later; nor was he the type of student who had to keep his nose to the grind-stone all the time and who was therefore unable to appreciate what was taking place around him. Instead we gather that he was the type of brilliant student who would not have been so rigidly confined to his books that he could not take an interest in topical events especially of the magnitude and significance of the crucifixion of Jesus, had he been in Palestine (cp. Gal. 1. 14). On the other hand, he does not seem to have been in Palestine during the ministry of John the Baptist. It is therefore all the more remarkable that not only did he suddenly appear on the scene around the time of the trial and death of Stephen, but he was also regarded as the suited man to be commissioned by the chief priests to crush the new sect which threatened the Jewish religion (Acts 26. 9ff). He himself tells us that he "persecuted the Church of God and made havoc of it" (Gal. 1. 13).

Our suggestion is that Farrer was correct in stating that Saul the Pharisee was a missionary of Pharisaism but we would go further and say that he was out of the country, perhaps during the ministry of John the Baptist and certainly all through the three years of our Lord's Ministry.

Harnack refers to the Jewish apostolate which was probably in existence in St Paul's day. They were usually people of high rank, who were sent out into the Diaspora with encyclical epistles issued by the central authority, to collect tribute for the Temple, and who also kept the "churches" in touch with Jerusalem and with each other. They seem to have been appointed by the high priests. They were also authorized as in the case of one Joseph, who was sent to Cilicia, to restore good order where it had broken down and to suppress any heretical religious movements.[13] This appreciation of the functions of the Jewish apostles seems to make intelligible the nature of the activities of Saul the Pharisee in Jerusalem (Acts 8. 2; 22. 4f; 26. 9f) and his mission to Damascus. Had he in fact just returned from a long and extended tour of the Diaspora in time to be present when Stephen was arraigned? Or for that matter had the authorities recalled him to Jerusalem to help bring under control the menace of Christianity after the grand debut of the Apostles at Pentecost? Saul's activities in Jerusalem and his mission to Damascus with "letters to the synagogues" to suppress the young Christian Church is much in keeping with those of Joseph to which Harnack refers. For Harnack, this seems to be almost conclusive

evidence that Paul was an apostle of Judaism in his pre-Christian days, although he refrains from being dogmatic about it.[14]

We would suggest that before his conversion St Paul was an accomplished missionary accustomed to long tours in an effort to spread Judaism. This suggestion would further explain why he so readily undertook to be a missionary of the Gentiles and in particular his zeal and thoroughness in arranging for the "collection for the saints" in Jerusalem (Gal. 2. 10). If as Harnack suggests, "the primitive apostles, considered themselves the central body of Christendom, and also the representatives of the true Israel", we can understand how they adopted the Jewish practice of asking the Christians in the Diaspora to send tribute to the mother Church. It then does become understandable that on the disciples' discovering the new convert, Saul, who had some experience in this programme, they asked him to undertake it and, further, why Saul agreed to perform the task "zealously" (Gal. 1. 10).[15]

Daube has also called attention to Jewish missionary maxims in the writings of St Paul, mentioning particularly the "intimate association of the duty of humble service with that of accommodation" as in Rom. 12. 16 (with the first part of the verse rendered "Mind not high things but condescend to low ones"), and in 1 Cor. 9. 19. Daube maintains that St Paul adopted this idea "from traditional Jewish teaching". He also suggests that the use of the verb *kerdaino*, for "to win over an unbeliever" belongs to the same Jewish traditional pattern.[16]

Deissmann also has suggested that Romans 2. 21 is based on St Paul's observation of fellow-zealots which caused a conflict between his own will and performance and the external piety and the inner corruption which existed in his surroundings and everywhere else in the world. He adds the comment that Saul the Pharisee must have been a fanatical enthusiast of Judaism (cp. Gal. 1. 14; Acts 22. 3) who, though he was ready to follow in the wake of the Maccabean martyrs (cp. 1 Cor. 13. 3), had also felt a distress over his own salvation.[17] Had St Paul then discovered from his pre-Christian travels that the strict observance of the Law which he must have enjoined on his audiences, did not satisfy his own inner cravings, and more so, had not won over many proselytes to Judaism (cp. Rom. 8. 3)? Had he in fact then started to rethink his presentation of Judaism to the Gentiles in a way more likely to win converts and therefore adopted the difference in outlook about which Montefiore

complains?[18] Of course he was in good standing with the Jewish authorities when Stephen was stoned, and therefore Anderson Scott is probably right in suggesting that he might have been the "leader of the fanatical crowd (no doubt largely composed of Pharisees)" who arraigned and stoned Stephen.[19]

Referring to Paul's own statement that after his conversion he came to "the climes of Tarsus and Cilicia" but was unknown to the churches of Judaea, "only they heard say, 'He that once persecuted us now preaches the faith' " (Gal. 1. 21), Ramsay concludes that "Paul and Luke (i.e. Acts 9. 30 and 11. 25) complete each other, and make up a picture of over ten years of quiet work within the range of the synagogue and its influence".[20] Ramsay's conclusions seem to us substantially correct, but we would add that it is highly probable that St Paul made successful contacts with non-Jews in Tarsus and Cilicia. This suggestion would explain more satisfactorily why Barnabas sought Paul out to bring him to the amorphous Christian community in Antioch and, probably more so, why St Paul was so easily accommodated to the Gentiles in that Church as to become their champion (Gal. 2. 11-21).

Perhaps we ought at this point to review the development of the church in Antioch as given in Acts 11. The first missionaries, probably mainly Jews, preached to Jews of the Dispersion living in that city. But some of the Cypriote and Cyrenian Christians among them began to preach to the Gentiles.[21] The church in Jerusalem heard of their success and sent a fellow-Cypriot, Barnabas, to help build up that work. Barnabas is favourably impressed with their achievements and later goes out to seek for Paul (Saul), we think, to help him establish the growing community of heathen converts to Christianity (Acts 11. 20f). If this interpretation is accepted, we can better appreciate the significance of the other visits to the city which St Paul describes for us in Gal. 2.

First, Peter, the bridge-man, but primarily the Apostle of the Circumcision (Gal. 2. 7), goes to Antioch; he mixes with everybody in the young church which seems to have begun to learn to overcome racial discrimination. So he eats even with Gentiles. Next, the Judaizers follow in order to strengthen, probably, the work done among the Jewish Christians and to stress the validity of their own attitude to Christianity. On arrival, they are scandalized by Peter's behaviour and call him to order. He reverts to type; even Barnabas is carried away by their protest (Gal. 2. 12f). Paul on the

other hand stands firm and remains constant with the "heathen" Christians; he even rebukes Peter for his defection (Gal. 2. 11). In our opinion this analysis of the situation in the church of Antioch will explain more satisfactorily than hitherto the background of the account of St Paul's commission as given in Acts 22. 21 and Rom. 15. 15f.

The convert on the Damascus road therefore seems to us to have undergone a re-orientation of his energies towards the conversion of the heathen to a religious life which was not pagan. Before that conversion, he had striven to make them proselytes of Judaism but afterwards, he strove equally hard to make them Christians. We would say that as a Jewish missionary, he had found his work heavy going and frustrating. But as a Christian, he now had reason "to be proud" of his work (Rom. 15. 17, R.S.V.). The disobedient Gentiles who had been slow to accept Judaism had been won over to "obedience" by the power of the Holy Spirit (Rom. 15. 15f). So instead of desiring to extend Judaism as he had before, he now preached "the Gospel of Christ" where it had never been preached before (Rom. 15. 19f).

Viewing St Paul's conversion on these terms, we can see that his energies underwent a complete orientation. He still possessed the marks of an apostle but now as an apostle of Christ (1 Cor. 12. 12). He has authority but not that of the chief priests; he is now the "slave of Jesus Christ". So he no longer feels the same personal confidence which he once vaunted. Instead, he now confesses to weakness and humiliation (2 Cor. 12. 5f, 11; 13. 8; 2. 14-17; 3. 6). However, God's grace is sufficient to make him a faithful slave of Jesus Christ (1 Cor. 15. 10; 2 Cor. 3. 6; 12. 9).

On this interpretation, several apparently unintelligible aspects of the missionary work of St Paul seem to have a real coherence.

1. His activities in Tarsus and Cilicia soon after his conversion can be linked up with his work in Antioch and his position in the Council of Jerusalem. It is noteworthy that he subsequently became the leader of the missionary work of that church in other parts of Asia and in Europe.

2. Paul's exercise of authority and control over the churches he founded as e.g., Corinth, seems to be in keeping with the practice of the Jewish apostles e.g., 1 Cor. 5. 7; 2 Cor. 13. 3. The weighty letters he wrote (2 Cor. 10. 10) are of the same relevance. Perhaps the reference to his efforts to take "every thought captive to the

obedience of Christ" and to his "being ready to punish every disobedience" (2 Cor. 10. 5f) is also another example.

3. His attitude to the "collection for the saints in Jerusalem" seems to indicate a rich appreciation of the importance of the project. He regards it as a *koinonia* of material blessings between the "daughter" churches and Jerusalem in return for a *koinonia* of spiritual blessings bestowed on them by the Jerusalem church (Rom. 15. 26f; 2 Cor. 8. 24f. cp. 2 Cor. 8. 12-15; 9. 11). It was certainly a means of keeping the "daughter" churches in close contact with the "mother" church in Jerusalem. Only, this time the driving power is "the gospel of Christ" and not the Jewish Law. St Paul certainly seems to have understood how to organize the Collection (Rom. 16. 1f; 2 Cor. 8. 6; 9. 6ff).

4. The recurrent references to the "power" of the gospel can be better appreciated if we supplement the information explicitly given in the Epistles with the inference (from reasonable conjecture we hope) that in his earlier experience, the efforts to spread Judaism were resisted by the Gentiles. Now of course, the gospel he preached was "bearing fruit and increasing [growing, R.S.V.] in the whole world" (Col. 1. 3ff; Rom. 1. 24f; 2 Cor. 10. 3; 1 Thes. 1. 5).

1 *Life and Work of St Paul*, p. 13.
2 *St Paul, the Man and the Teacher*, p. 9.
3 So, Farrer, op. cit., p. 44, Conybeare and Howson, *St Paul*, p. 43.
4 Op. cit., p. 9.
5 *Theology of St Paul*, E.T. by Stoddard, Vol. II, p. 25, footnote.
6 Ibid. 7 Op. cit., p. 449, footnote.
8 *New Testament Doctrine of Christ*, p. 90, n. 5.
9 *New Testament Theology*, Vol. I, p. 238. 10 Op. cit. p. 53.
11 Op. cit., p. 78. 12 Op. cit., p. 53, footnote.
13 *Expansion of Christianity*, Vol. I, p. 409-14. 14 Op. cit., p. 413, n. 1.
15 Harnack, op. cit., p. 415.
16 *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, p. 346.
17 *St Paul*, pp. 94f; cp. Montefiore, *Judaism and St Paul*, p. 101.
18 Op. cit., pp. 96ff. 19 Op. cit., p. 10.
20 *St Paul the Traveller and Roman Citizen*, p. 47.
21 So, Jackson and Lake, *Beginnings of Christianity*, Vol. III, p. 106; Vol. IV, p. 128; Harnack, *The Acts of the Apostles*, p. 190.

LONDON PURITANISM: THE PARISH OF ST STEPHEN COLEMAN STREET

DOROTHY ANN WILLIAMS

THE HISTORY of Puritanism in the City of London during the thirty years preceding the Puritan Revolution has never been adequately described; probably because no extensive body of source material for its study exists. One way to fill this gap is to reconstruct facets of the picture of London Puritanism from the manuscript records of certain City organizations, such as the government of the Corporation, the great merchant companies, and the London parishes. This work, as far as it has gone, reveals that a surprisingly small number of London organizations actively supported the Puritan cause between 1610 and 1640. The City government showed Puritan sympathies before 1630, but they ceased abruptly in that year. Of the twelve livery companies, only the Haberdashers and Mercers consistently presented Puritans to benefices and lectureships in their gift. A mere handful of the hundred or more City parishes had a Puritan incumbent and a Puritan vestry.

Outstanding among the Puritan parishes in the City was St Stephen's, Coleman Street. Those familiar with the history of the Puritan Revolution and Civil Wars, with the prominent part played by the City of London, and with the names of Isaac Pennington, Owen Rowe, and Mark Hildesley recognize the leading role which St Stephen's, Coleman Street and its parishioners took in Puritan affairs after 1640. One historian, indeed, J. E. C. Hill, has called St Stephen's "the 'Faubourg St. Antoine' of the English Revolution". It is the purpose of this paper to describe the development of Puritanism in St Stephen's parish from the late sixteenth century to the beginning of the Revolution.

The thoroughgoing Puritanism apparent at St Stephen's during the 1630's was unusual in the City, for on the eve of the Puritan Revolution the London clergy were overwhelmingly anti-Puritan. One need only turn to the system of patronage in the City to understand this anomaly. In early seventeenth-century England, both Puritans and Anglicans condemned the high degree of lay patronage in the Church, which resulted in the appointment

of poorly qualified clergymen and the alienation of income from the Church. This criticism, however, could not be levelled at London. At the beginning of James' reign, when something like eighty per cent of church benefices with cure in the nation as a whole were estimated to have lay patrons, less than fifty per cent of the benefices in London were in the gift of lay individuals or organizations. High Church officials appointed the clergy of a majority of the London parishes. More than a third of the remaining livings were in the gift of the King, so that between them the Church and Crown had the right to choose more than two-thirds of the clergy beneficed in the City. Small likelihood, under these circumstances, that the regular clergy would be strongly infected with Puritanism!

But there remained between a quarter and a third of the London parishes, about thirty in number, which had as patrons either the City government, one of the City companies, a private individual, or lay trustees appointed by the parish itself. Assuming freedom from outside influence, which was not always the case by any means, one would expect such patrons to select clergymen of their own religious colour, whether Puritan or orthodox. Conversely, the Puritan or non-Puritan character of a newly appointed cleric ought to provide a valuable clue to the religious leanings of the parish, or at least of its leading members. The mere fact that a parish had the right to choose its own incumbent did not guarantee the selection of a Puritan, but a parish already inclined towards Puritanism would ordinarily elect a Puritan preacher.

Although lay patronage had been common in the English Church throughout the Middle Ages, the vesting of patronage in men acting as trustees for the parish itself had been one of the results of the Reformation. The dissolution of the monasteries, and other ecclesiastical changes which occurred during the reign of Henry VIII, had transferred more than lands from Church to Crown. Also handed to the King were many advowsons (the right to present the incumbent to a church living) and impropriations (the right to collect the tithes and endowments of a living). He and his successors granted or sold many of these rights to nobles, wealthy merchants, City corporations, merchant companies, and—though rarely—to the parishes themselves.

Between the Reformation and the accession of James I, six parishes in the City of London acquired the right of presentation to their living, thus becoming their own patron. While parochial

election of a new incumbent meant lay election and therefore an increase in lay control over ecclesiastical affairs, this type of lay control was less open to abuse than that of a wealthy patron more interested in the commercial value of his presentative rights than in the welfare of the parish and its incumbent. On the other hand, the parish, more than any other type of lay patron, might feel inclined to dominate the thoughts and actions of their elected cleric.

St Stephen's, Coleman Street was the most important of the six City parishes which possessed direct presentative rights in 1603. Also, there existed at St Stephen's a special financial situation which strengthened the parish's hand *vis à vis* both the vicar and the bishop, who, as was the case in every parish, was required to institute a new incumbent. Since the fifteenth century the annual endowment of the living, to which the vicar was entitled by right, had been only £11—far from an adequate yearly income. After acquiring the advowson the parishioners increased the vicar's stipend substantially. For instance, in 1600 they gave John Dodd an augmentation of £19, bringing his annual income to £30. Later in the century the incumbent was receiving considerably more than £60 per annum—everything above £11 being especially granted to him by the parishioners "in manifestacon of their loue". It is no wonder that in these circumstances the parish could exact from the vicar special promises, such as that he would preach to them twice on the Sabbath in person or provide "some other godly minister" if he himself could not be present.

The bishop, as well as the incumbent of the parish, was circumscribed by the parishioners' power over the vicar's income. When the living fell vacant, the diocesan could hardly refuse to approve the parish's vicar-elect. Even if he could have forced them to accept his own nominee, he could not have made them supplement an unwanted incumbent's income, and no vicar could have subsisted long on £11 a year. The bishop's only hope would have been to find a compromise candidate acceptable to both himself and the parish. The chance of an orthodox bishop influencing St Stephen's election of a new vicar was slight indeed.

Yet the power which the leaders of St Stephen's parish had come to wield over the election and income of their vicar had not been achieved easily, nor did the original acquisition of this control indicate that St Stephen's was already a Puritan parish. In fact, when the parishioners purchased their impropriate rectory and

advowson from Queen Elizabeth in 1590, the parish was not strongly Puritan. It is likely that desperation, rather than Puritanism, forced the parishioners to take that step—desperation over the miserable endowment of their church which had kept the parish from having a regular incumbent for about thirty years. Probably they reasoned that if they could raise the money to buy the impropriation and advowson and could supplement the incumbent's stipend, they might hope to attract and hold a qualified vicar in the future.

The churchwardens of St Stephen's did raise the Queen's price by borrowing money from parishioners and others, and by selling some of the parish lands, and on the ninth of January, 1589/90, letters patent were issued at Westminster granting to certain parishioners, as trustees, the impropriated rectory, advowson, and fee farm of the parish for £339 12s.

No immediate change in the administration of St Stephen's parsonage occurred. In fact, it took the parish about five years to establish their right to appoint a vicar and to augment his income. The churchwardens' account for the year ending 24 June 1593 shows for the first time that the curate, William Taylor, was paid £37 10s. for a year and a quarter's service. Several bits of evidence point to the fact that the parishioners wanted to make Taylor their vicar, but that it was easier to wish this than to achieve it. For example, another clerk, William Wells, who had served the cure and been presented (though not instituted) to the vicarage, probably before the parish bought the advowson, was paid £10 during 1592-3 to resign the presentation. The next year the churchwardens expended some of their funds in searching out and having copied the legal papers relating to possession of the vicarage, and in forestalling a presentation to the living. In 1594-5 the vicar-general Dr Stanhope, actually appointed a minister to serve the cure, but the parish managed to get rid of him very quickly. Meanwhile, William Taylor was officiating at St Stephen's for six months of the year, and the parishioners were making a house ready for him as vicar.

In 1595-6 Taylor was finally referred to in the accounts as "vicar"; the parishioners paid him a total of £30 that year, almost three times the endowment of the vicarage. At last the parish's theoretical right to appoint their vicar, which they had purchased from the Queen five years earlier, had become concrete reality.

What is more, St Stephen's, Coleman Street was on the way to becoming a desirable living in the eyes of the clergy. By the time of William Taylor's death, sometime in 1597 or 1598, at least five candidates petitioned for the benefice.

Although enjoying their first taste of parochial control in the 1590's and early 1600's, the leaders of St Stephen's parish were still not interested in putting a Puritan preacher into the pulpit. Neither John Dodd (not to be confused with the Puritan rector of Fawsley, Northamptonshire), who succeeded Taylor, nor Richard Watson, elected in 1609, was ever considered a member of the "Puritan brotherhood". Nor, apparently, was Samuel German, Watson's successor. A totally different type of clergyman, however, was chosen by the parish in the 1620's and 1630's. Every student of Puritan history is familiar with the names of John Davenport and John Goodwin, St Stephen's next two vicars, for they were two of the most prominent Puritan preachers in England during the early seventeenth century. Any London parish which could elect and attract them, at a time when it was dangerous to preach Puritanism in London, must have been dominated by Puritans.

It is much easier to describe St Stephen's gravitation into the Puritan fold than to explain it. Although the parishioners' purchase of the advowson and rectory did not mean that the parish was Puritan, it did open the door for the development of Puritanism, with its emphasis upon individual salvation and its tendency to minimize the episcopal hierarchy. St Stephen's was a heavily populated parish—the vicar in 1631 described it as having 1400 communicants—but its affairs were controlled, on the lay side, by fewer than a hundred householders who were entitled to attend the meetings of the general vestry. Practical power was vested in a much smaller body, the vestry of committees, a select vestry composed of from twenty-five to thirty-five of the most important householders, including the vicar and churchwardens, to whose discretion the larger vestry had presumably "committed" the parish's day-to-day problems.

St Stephen's was one of many London parishes to possess both a general and a select vestry. Concerning the origin of select vestries in parochial administration, the Webbs have said that most of them probably arose "from some sort of resolution or agreement of the chief or other parishioners attending the Easter [general] Vestry meeting, some time in the fifteenth or sixteenth century". The select

vestry was "merely an extra-legal constitution for the government of the parish . . ." During the late sixteenth century and the seventeenth century it was not uncommon for the clergyman and churchwardens of a parish to apply to the bishop for a faculty establishing or confirming the existence of a select vestry. St Stephen's obtained such a faculty from the Bishop of London in 1619.

The original relationship of the select vestry to the general vestry seems to have become gradually inverted, so that the latter body often appeared to act as a rubber stamp for the actions of the former. At St Stephen's, the general vestry met regularly only twice a year, during Christmas and Easter week, to elect parish officers. Special meetings of the general vestry were sometimes held to elect a vicar (already nominated by the vestry of committees) or to take care of other urgent parish business. But by the early seventeenth century all the pressing day-to-day problems of St Stephen's parish were being handled by the important vestry of committees, not by the general vestry. Generally speaking, for Puritan decisions to prevail in the parish, it was only necessary that a majority of the select vestrymen be Puritans.

It has not been possible to identify and characterize conclusively as Puritans more than two or three of the men whose names appear on the lists of those present at meetings of the select and general vestries of St Stephen's, during the years between 1610 and 1640. For this reason the Puritanism or non-Puritanism of the vestrymen has had to be determined by means of a practical test. If one of the vestries made a decision which indicated Puritanism, such as choosing a Puritan vicar, it has been concluded that a majority of the vestrymen at that time were Puritans. On this basis it appears that during the 1620's and 1630's more than half of the leading parishioners of St Stephen's actively supported the Puritan cause.

The acquisition of the right to present their vicar and control his income had given the lay oligarchy of St Stephen's parish a sense of power over their own religious life which was synonymous with the outlook of Puritanism. Gradually they became bolder and more independent, until by the 1620's they were ready to risk a battle with ecclesiastical and secular authority in order to replace an unsatisfactory vicar with an outspoken Puritan. Fundamentally, this battle was fought over the question whether the parish's right to elect and pay their vicar implied the additional right to deprive him

of his income and perhaps even his living. Apparently the leaders of the parish assumed that they could exercise this added power, but in making such an attempt they were challenging two of the basic rights of the episcopal hierarchy, the right to discipline a clergyman and to deprive him of his office, and they were virtually setting themselves up as a self-governing congregation. This challenge was not to be borne lightly by the Bishop of London, especially when it emanated from an obstreperous City parish lying almost within the shadow of his own cathedral.

The lines were drawn in January, 1622/3 when approximately ninety of the leading parishioners of St Stephen's met in a general vestry to strip their vicar, Samuel German, of all income except his rightful £11 per annum. In taking this drastic action they reasoned that the rest of his annual revenue (consisting of a lump sum of £39, certain "casualties", the communion book, and his dwelling house) had been granted to him by a free-will vote of a previous vestry, with the stipulation that it was to continue "during the pleasure of the greatest pte of the Parishioners and no longer". Since the majority of the parishioners no longer desired to continue the augmentations, these were to cease. Doubtless the vestry had a deeper intention than to reduce German to poverty. They wished to make him resign his living.

The vestry minutes contain only a few hints as to the reason for this drastic decision. The initial reference to German claims that the vestry's action had been taken "vppon good consideracon and iust cause . . ." Later entries refer to the abuses German had committed "both in Life and Doctrine", criticize his conversation and behaviour, and declare that he had neglected his ministry and attacked his parishioners "wth contynuall Calumnyes in Pulpitt & out". Apparently German was a disagreeable individual, and, in addition, the doctrine which he preached offended his parishioners. That German had an unpleasant disposition is indicated by his record at Oxford, where he took the M.A. degree in 1609 and was a fellow between 1610 and 1620. In January, 1612 "he was deprived of office as tutor to the sophists for rudeness to the Dean of Arts, and also deprived of commons for a week for quarrelsome words, and again for a week, 19 March, 1613/4, for being in the town without leave" (W. D. Macray, *A Register of the Members of St. Mary Magdalen College, Oxford*. III, 136). It is possible that during his ministry at St Stephen's German brought his rancour to bear

against his Puritan parishioners. He himself could not have been a member of the Puritan brotherhood, for his name does not appear in any of the annals of Puritanism, and before coming to St Stephen's in 1618 he had been rector of St Olave, Jewry, of which James I was patron. Nevertheless, the exact cause of the conflict between German and his parishioners is less important than the fact that this conflict illustrates the determination, self-assurance, and righteousness that characterized the lay leaders of St Stephen's parish during and after the 1620's. This attitude on the part of laymen here and there in the City helps to account for the strength of Puritanism in London before 1640, despite the scarcity of Puritans among the City clergy.

Samuel German was as determined to retain his post at St Stephen's as the parishioners were to be rid of him. After learning of the parish's decision to cut off his allowance, German submitted a petition to the Lord Keeper, Dr John Williams, Bishop of Lincoln. Bishop Williams commissioned the Bishop of London, George Montaigne, to act on his behalf, and Bishop Montaigne summoned certain members of the vestry of committees to appear before him. This interview had no effect other than to reduce the size of the majority in favour of impoverishing German.

Next the Bishop of London dispatched a letter to the parish commanding them to call a meeting of the general vestry to reconcile the differences between them and their vicar. Only one of the seventy-eight men present voted to reinstate German. During the next few days the Lord Keeper himself took action and directed the parish to invest their vicar with his full income and to show cause why an injunction should not be granted him to enjoy his former stipend. But the lay leaders of St Stephen's were not to be turned from their righteous determination by either Bishop Montaigne or Bishop Williams, even when the latter held one of the highest secular offices in the realm. At a general vestry meeting on 10 June, the forty-seven men in attendance calmly drew up an "answeare wth a peticon". This reiterated the fundamental attitude of the parish toward their vicar: that all income he had formerly received above £11 a year had been a conditional free-will grant of the parish, which he had acknowledged as such, and that his conduct did not warrant its continuance. The petition ended boldly by inviting the Lord Keeper's favour toward the parishioners for their

initial liberality, which was "nowe Indeavoured to be inforced as a duty by an vndeservinge man".

Thus far every order of the Lord Keeper had been fruitless, whether channeled through Bishop Montaigne or sent directly to the parish as a whole. About the middle of June—five months after the vestry had reduced German's salary—the Lord Keeper called in a parishioner who might be expected to sympathize with the official point of view and whose mediation with the parish would be effective. This was Maurice Abbott, one of the newly elected common councilmen for Coleman Street Ward and brother to George Abbott, the Archbishop of Canterbury. But even this diplomatic move did not bear immediate fruit. In response to a message carried by Abbott from Bishop Williams to the vestry of committees, negotiations were undertaken with the vicar, but no agreement was reached. For the fourth time the efforts of the Lord Keeper, based upon the fundamental view that no parish had the right to discipline or deprive a clergyman, were of no avail. One more series of events was required to break the deadlock. It was touched off by German, who submitted a final plea to the Lord Keeper. The latter again called in Maurice Abbott, who reported to the select vestry on 22 June that "the pleasur and desire of the right hono^{r} the Lo: Keep of the greate seale of England is, That mr. German notwthstandinge ffore passed matters should be kindly dealte wthall". More negotiations, this time successful, took place immediately between German and the vestry. Concessions were made on both sides. German agreed to perform his duties satisfactorily and to take what the parish would offer him, acknowledging that the only income rightfully his was the £11 endowment of the vicarage. The parish in turn granted him an additional £43 per annum (£39 benevolence plus £4 for his "Chamber rent") "during the good will & pleasure of the Parish & no longer". Any former allowances and casualties German had had were to be withdrawn, so that his total stipend would not exceed £54. Payments were to be made to him quarterly by the churchwardens, beginning almost immediately.

So at last the battle between St Stephen's vestry and their vicar came to an end. The financial settlement is less important in regard to the few pounds involved than for the method of payment which was stipulated. Instead of being free to collect his own fees for christenings, weddings, and burials, as well as the Easter offering,

the vicar was to receive a flat annual sum from the churchwardens. In addition, although German had regained his position and a good income, the parish had succeeded in re-emphasizing that four-fifths of his salary was under their control. Not only did German have to acknowledge this fact with his signature, but the terms of the agreement must have been conveyed to the Lord Keeper and the Bishop of London. The vestry minute describing the parish's final settlement with German reveals no attitude of defeat, but rather an insistence upon the vicar's complete economic dependence on the good will of his parishioners. The wonder is, not that the parish was finally forced to come to an agreement with German, but that they managed for so long to ignore the orders of two of the highest ecclesiastical and secular officials in the land!

Samuel German was reinstated by the parish in June 1623. In September 1624 he died. During the intervening months, peace did not reign between the vicar and his parishioners. In February, 1623/4 German claimed that the Easter book was his by right. When this claim was denied, he asked for it as a voluntary grant, but again he was refused. His reluctance to comply with the June agreement by giving up all the allowances he had formerly enjoyed is also shown by the fact that he would not turn over to the parish the rent money from the vicar's house, which was occupied by one of the parishioners. The tension between St Stephen's parish and Samuel German was ended only by German's death, and his burial in the parish on 28 September 1624. In December, after confirming the election of a new vicar, the vestry of committees voted to pay German's burial charges. So closed the stormy twenty months of conflict between the parishioners and the vicar they did not want.

Step by step the lay leaders of St Stephen's were showing forth the independence of thought and action, the daring required to challenge authority, and the interest in popular preaching which characterized the Puritan cause on the eve of the Revolution. In the 1590's they had purchased the advowson and impropriation of their vicarage, and after initial opposition had succeeded in presenting to the living a vicar of their own choice. In 1623 they had attempted to get rid of an incumbent because they disapproved of his doctrine and conduct; the attempt had not succeeded because the vicar had found powerful allies in the Bishop of London and the Lord Keeper. In 1624 the parish became embroiled in another contest which, before it was settled, had attracted the attention not only of the

Bishop of London, but of one of the secretaries of state, of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and of the King himself. This dispute focused directly upon the developing issue of Puritanism.

After the death of German, the general vestry of St Stephen's was summoned to meet on 5 October to elect a new vicar. Seventy-four parishioners attended the meeting. Two clergymen were nominated —John Davenport, then curate and lecturer at St Lawrence, Old Jewry, and a Mr Wilson, chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury. All but three or four of the vestrymen voted for Davenport.

Only twenty-seven years old at this time, John Davenport had come to London from his birthplace, Coventry, via Oxford. He was already well known in the City for his fearlessness in visiting the sick during the plague and for his popular preaching at St Lawrence's church, which stood next to Guildhall, not far from St Stephen's parish. During his five-year ministry there, he had acquired the reputation of being "puritannically affected". When Davenport's name was presented to the Bishop of London for approval, two thoughts may have come to the Bishop's mind. One was the fact that the King had already ordered him to quiz Davenport about his sermons and doctrine, which had given offence to some. The other was the remembrance of recent difficulties with the determined parishioners of St Stephen's. In consequence Bishop Montaigne refused to approve the parish's election or to admit Davenport to the vicarage.

For a month Davenport's future hung in the balance and St Stephen's was without an incumbent. Judging by the vestry minutes, the parish maintained a discreet silence during this period, permitting the vicar-elect to conduct his own campaign. Of this, Davenport was fully capable. The tactics he employed consisted of addressing a battery of letters to two influential friends—Sir Edward Conway, a privy councillor and principal secretary of state, and Mary, Lady Vere, Conway's sister-in-law and the wife of Sir Horace Vere. They, in turn, engaged in correspondence with the Bishop and the Archbishop on Davenport's behalf. The outstanding feature of this round of correspondence is the repeated assertion that Davenport was conformable to all the ecclesiastical and civil regulations of the day, including the use of the surplice, the sign of the cross in baptism, and the administration of the sacrament only to those communicants who kneeled. This assertion was accompanied by

the statement that unsavoury reports of Davenport's ministry could only have been prompted by malice.

Secretary Conway's mediation with the Bishop, Archbishop, and King proved successful. Finally Bishop Montaigne agreed to examine Davenport personally, found his answers satisfactory, and inducted him into the vicarage of St Stephen, Coleman Street. Early in November Davenport took official possession of the parsonage, to the joyous tolling of the church bells. Thus the parishioners expressed their delight in obtaining a vicar who was not only a stirring preacher but also an effective diplomatist. This happy ending to the election dispute represented a further step in the parish's establishment of control over their own affairs.

Pleased as they were with their new parson, the parishioners did not for a moment think of forfeiting their authority over his income. On the contrary, the new vicar agreed to acknowledge that he was entitled to the £11 endowment only, and that no future incumbent would have a right to more. Then, to show their appreciation, the vestry of committees added an extra £39 to Davenport's annual salary, increasing it to £50. In addition, they offered him what had been denied to Samuel German—the vicar's house (worth £14 a year), and the freedom to collect the vicar's fees for christenings, weddings, and burials. These augmentations were guaranteed to Davenport so long as he remained at St Stephen's. He, for his part, promised to fulfil all the functions of his ministry and to preach twice each Sabbath day, supplying "some other godly minister" if he could not be present himself. The parish's generous treatment of Davenport did not end with this original contract. The vestry of committees voted him a benevolence here, a gratuity there; it authorized the expenditure of several small sums to rebuild his pew and supply it with new matting and hassocks; it ordered the churchwardens to allow him £13 6s. 8d. a year towards his costs in maintaining a curate. This would be convincing evidence of the parishioners' devotion to Davenport, if any evidence were needed.

St Stephen's election of John Davenport in 1624 has been cited to prove that the parish had definitely aligned itself with Puritanism—the culmination of a steady process of development which had begun in the 1590's. Certainly the official reluctance on the part of both Church and State to admit Davenport to the benefice would support that conclusion. And yet, Davenport had been admitted, and his chief supporter, Sir Edward Conway, had guaranteed his

absolute conformity to the regulations and ceremonies of the Church. Was Davenport a Puritan, or was he not?

A variety of definitions of Puritanism have been put forward by historians, ranging all the way from Knappen's use of the word to indicate the outlook of the reformist English Protestants (including Presbyterians, Independents, Separatists, Non-Separatists, and many Anglicans) to Jordan's statement that Puritanism, which was basically a protest against Catholic survivals in the Church of England, was not separatist. The majority of Puritans in the 1620's conformed sufficiently to the ecclesiastical regulations to remain in the Church. Yet their occasional nonconformity, their support of certain organizations which had been founded to promote the Puritan cause both inside and outside England, and their tendency to show less and less respect for the canons during the 1630's marked them as Puritans and therefore as potential threats to the Establishment. John Davenport is a case in point. Only a few months after taking up his position as vicar of St Stephen's, Davenport associated himself with the "society of feoffees for the purchase of impropriations", a well-known organization of Londoners who had conceived a plan for gradual reform of the Church of England. Briefly, it was their purpose to buy up church impropriations in the hands of laymen and to use the income from these impropriations to support Puritan lectures and to increase the salaries of Puritan clergymen throughout England. The Puritan character of this society is beyond question. Between 1625 and 1633 the vicar of St Stephen's not only collected money for it, but also served as one of its four clerical governors or feoffees. The man whom Secretary Conway had described in his letter to Archbishop Abbott as an "eminent and well deserving light in the Church" was beginning to remodel that Church according to the Puritan ideal!

A second Puritan project into which Davenport threw his energies and funds was the Massachusetts Bay Company. Like many other Englishmen, he was not satisfied to promote Puritanism in England alone; he saw the wisdom also of establishing a colony overseas where Puritans might take refuge and control their own religious and civic life. In the 1620's he became an adventurer in the Massachusetts Bay Company and contributed £50 toward obtaining the patent for the colony, although his name was not included among the patentees "because he himself desired it might be omitted, lest his enemy, the Bishop of *London*, then of the King's

privy council, should upon his account appear the more fiercely against it" (Cotton Mather, *Magnalia Christi Americana*, I, 296).

Davenport engaged in other activities which stamped him as a Puritan in the eyes of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. He helped edit the manuscript sermons of John Preston, probably the leading Puritan minister in England in the 1620's, who died in 1628. In 1627 Davenport joined with other Puritan preachers in attempting to raise money for the Protestant ministers in the Palatinate of the Rhine who had been driven from their homes by the Catholic forces in the Thirty Years' War. Bishop Laud, who had opposed the idea of holding a public collection for the refugees, stopped the Puritan plan for promoting a private subscription by summoning Davenport and the three other preachers to appear before the High Commission. But neither of these activities involved nonconformity; indeed, as late as 1631 Davenport did conform to the canons of the Church.

In that year a quarrel with his curate, Timothy Hood, required Davenport to answer in writing sixteen objections which Hood had made against him. These answers, addressed to Bishop Laud, constituted a statement of Davenport's conformity, though not so rigorous as the assertions he had made in 1624. Davenport affirmed that he wore the surplice, read the Litany, and attempted to prevent strangers from attending communion. The communion, he acknowledged, had to be administered from pew to pew because St Stephen's fourteen hundred communicants were too numerous to go up to the communion table. He had to admit that many of the pews were too crowded to permit kneeling, but denied that anyone refusing to kneel was given the sacrament.

But the vicar of St Stephen's, originally a moderate, conforming, Puritan, who submitted to the ceremonies rather than making an issue of them, was drawing nearer and nearer to becoming a nonconformist, and therefore a danger to the religious Establishment. The cause of his final defection seems to have been a conference with John Cotton, who had fled from his vicarage in Boston, Lincolnshire, to evade the High Commission and imprisonment, and who was sheltered in and around London during part of 1632 and 1633 by Davenport and others. In this interval the London preachers held a conference with Cotton in order to persuade him to conform, but the discussion had the very opposite result. Cotton convinced his friends that the ceremonies of the Church, far from being un-

important, were evils which it was their duty to oppose. From this time forth, Davenport seems to have refused to conform to the canons.

In 1633 two other events further affected Davenport's position in the Church: the dissolution of the society of feoffees for impropriations in February, and, in August, the promotion of William Laud from London to Canterbury. In Easter term 1632, the Attorney-General had filed an information against the feoffees in the equity side of the Court of Exchequer. Hearings were held early in 1633, and the decree was handed down in mid-February. This dissolved the society and confiscated all its property to the use of the King. For several months afterward, criminal proceedings were threatened against Davenport and the other feoffees.

It had been apparent since 1631 that William Laud would be the next Archbishop of Canterbury. As Bishop of London he had shown himself the relentless antagonist of the Puritans, disagreeing with them on every important issue. Where they desired simplicity in worship, he insisted upon ceremony; where they believed in strict adherence to Calvinistic doctrine, he had adopted and was introducing into the Church of England the new teachings of Arminianism; where they emphasized the rights of the individual and supported Parliament, he exalted authority and buttressed the royal prerogative. Laud's rise to power first in the diocese of London and then over the Church as a whole accounts in large part for the growth and changing character of the Puritan movement in the 1630's. Davenport's adoption of nonconformity was typical of the reaction of those Puritan preachers who had lost hope of "purifying" the English Church by a process of inner evolution.

Even before Laud's elevation to Canterbury, John Davenport began to take a less active part in the life of St Stephen's parish. The last vestry meeting at which he was definitely present was held on 3 April 1633. His name does not appear on the list of those who attended the meeting of either 23 or 30 April. In fact, on 30 April the vestry of committees agreed that Davenport should be paid £20 from the parish funds towards his expenses in going to and coming from Bath.

During the remainder of his tenure as vicar of St Stephen's, Davenport's movements were veiled in such secrecy that it is difficult to reconstruct them. One account of his activities during this period states that on Monday, 5 August (the day following

Archbishop Abbott's death) he left London, "ostensibly to visit a friend a few miles from the city. Because of a report that he had fled and that a pursuivant had been sent after him, he remained in concealment. . . . Throughout his life fearful of the future, he was convinced by the examination of the churchwardens of St Stephen's that the new archbishop intended to prosecute him to the utmost, and that a dark cloud was about to descend upon him. Laying his case before a general vestry of his parish, he was advised that it would be best for all concerned if he quietly resigned. This he did, justifying his departure on the grounds that Laud's persecution was directed against him personally and not against the church in general. He left without letters of dismissal and so secretively that it is impossible to tell from the minutes of the vestry just when his connection with the parish of St. Stephen, Coleman Street, came to an end." (Isabel M. Calder, *The New Haven Colony*, pp. 21-2). Sometime in November Davenport left England for Holland; on 18 December his successor was instituted as vicar of St Stephen's.

The rest of Davenport's career bears little relation to his old London parish, except for the fact that when he finally set sail for New England in 1637, many of his former parishioners accompanied him, and several former inhabitants of the parish were already in Massachusetts Bay. Of the dozen or so families accompanying Davenport, the largest consisted of Theophilus Eaton's numerous relations by blood and marriage. Eaton, a boyhood friend of Davenport's who had lived in St Stephen's parish since about 1630, was a successful merchant who had been a member of the Eastland Company and the Massachusetts Bay Company. When Davenport, not finding Holland to his liking, had returned to England in 1636 with ideas of emigrating to America, he and Eaton had organized a new company to establish a colony in New England. After great difficulty and delay, they and their followers arrived in Boston harbour in June 1637. Their original intention had been to settle within the territory of the Massachusetts Bay Company, but for various reasons they decided to establish a colony at Quinnipiac, on Long Island Sound. The new town which they built was beneficently named New Haven. Neither Eaton, who became the governor of the colony, nor Davenport, who became its pastor, ever saw England again.

It had been Davenport's view that Laud's antagonism was directed against him personally, and that if he resigned, St Stephen's parish would no longer be the target of the Archbishop's animosity. That the parish leaders may have agreed with Davenport on this point is hinted by the fact that in the vestry minutes for 1632 and 1633 there is no mention at all of the vicar's absence from the parish, nor of his alleged meeting with the vestry. There is no record that the vestrymen tried to dissuade Davenport from resigning. Despite his great popularity, they recognized the impossibility of retaining an incumbent who was a nonconformist. They wanted a Puritan vicar, but they could not justify a separatist vicar.

To replace Davenport the parish leaders found John Goodwin, a Puritan but not a nonconformist. Elected by the general vestry on 4 December 1633, Goodwin was instituted by Bishop Juxon on December 18. The vestry of committees registered their satisfaction with Goodwin the day before his institution by granting him the same generous allowance his predecessor had had. The contract made with Goodwin was virtually the same as that which had been concluded with Davenport, including the vicar's acknowledgement that everything he was to receive above £11 was due to the bounty and love of the parishioners. Three months later a general vestry granted Goodwin all the tithes which would accrue during his residency, and about four years after that he was given £30 toward the lease of his house.

The ease with which the new vicar's election was approved by the Bishop of London, in contrast to the long dispute over Davenport's induction, may have been due to the fact that Goodwin had never held a benefice in London, but had been rector of the distant parish of East Raynham, Norfolk. Very little is known of his life prior to his arrival in London, except that he had taken a Master of Arts degree at Cambridge and had been a popular preacher in three or four Norfolk parishes.

Nevertheless, Goodwin's actions after 1633 testify convincingly to his Puritanism and therefore to the Puritanism of the parish which elected him. At the beginning of his London ministry, Goodwin's attitude toward the canons and ceremonies was not unlike Davenport's ten years before: he conformed when conformity was required. Several times before 1640, however, Goodwin was rebuked for disobeying the ecclesiastical regulations. During Laud's metropolitical visitation of 1635 he was convented for

violating the canons, and the following year, in a paper of Laud's entitled "Informations concerning the diocese of London, Anno Domini 1636", he was named among the clergymen accused of irregularities and nonconformity. Again, during the Archbishop's visitation of 1637, Goodwin was convented for breach of the canons. However, every time Goodwin was called before the authorities, his promises of submission and amendment halted further proceedings against him. Although his Puritan dislike of ceremony prompted him to evade the canons in his daily ministry, by refusing to make an issue of nonconformity he kept his post at St Stephen's throughout the crucial years preceding the Puritan Revolution.

After 1640 Goodwin adopted the radical Puritan outlook that conformity to the canons was unnecessary. When Davenport had reached that conclusion several years earlier, the religious and political situation had been such that he was forced to flee to foreign shores. Goodwin, on the other hand, by coming to an open break with the government and ceremony of the Laudian Church, simply kept in step with other critics of the Establishment in his own parish and at Westminster. Thus he was able to remain at St Stephen's so long as his views were approximately the same as those of the majority in Parliament.

This description of the development of Puritanism in St Stephen's parish ends with the advent of the Puritan Revolution of 1640-2. The word "Puritan" is too general a term to describe accurately the oppositon to the Church after 1642. By that time sharp differences regarding Church government, as well as other issues, such as toleration, had begun to divide the former body of Puritans into two main groups—the Presbyterians and the Independents. The struggle between Presbyterians and Independents in Parliament had its echo in Coleman Street, as in other City parishes. At St Stephen's it strongly affected the fortunes of John Goodwin, who was sequestered from the vicarage in 1645, became the invited pastor of an Independent congregation, and was later restored to his old parish living.

The vital role played by St Stephen's, Coleman Street in both religious and political affairs in London after 1640 could hardly have been foreseen by those quiet parishioners who had purchased the impropriation of their vicarage from Queen Elizabeth in 1590. Nor could they have prophesied that the chain of events they were

initiating would involve a struggle to establish their right to the patronage, an attempt to eject an unpopular vicar, a contest to obtain a Puritan incumbent, and the election of another Puritan who was destined to become a leading opponent of Church and Crown after 1640. The story of St Stephen's gradual approach to Puritanism before 1624 and its wholehearted adherence to Puritanism after that date constitutes one of the most fascinating chapters in the history of early seventeenth-century London. It illustrates the increasing confidence of the Puritan laity of London and the power which they were able to exert in certain parishes to ensure that Puritan decisions would dominate in parish life and that Puritanism would be preached from the pulpit. This zealous Puritanism among the laity helped to counteract the ecclesiastical and royal control of selection of most of the London clergy, and thus it paved the way for the outbreak of the Puritan Revolution.

NOTE

This article was written with the aid of a grant from the Social Science Research Council and of a fellowship from the International Federation of University Women.

Lack of space prevents publication of the original detailed notes, but the author wishes to acknowledge her indebtedness to H. Gareth Owen for his unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, "The London Parish Clergy in the Reign of Elizabeth I" (University of London, 1957), to Isabel M. Calder for her books *Letters of John Davenport, Puritan Divine*, and *The New Haven Colony*, and to Christopher Hill for his *Economic Problems of the Church from Archbishop Whitgift to the Long Parliament*.

Extensive use has been made of Guildhall Library MSS. 4457/2, 4458/1, 4456, 4449/1—the records of St Stephen's, Coleman Street.

WILLIAM WILBERFORCE—1759-1833

LAURENCE LARTER

IN THIS YEAR which marks the bicentenary of the birth of William Wilberforce, I should like to offer this very inadequate sketch of his life and work, as the humble tribute of a Hull citizen to a most illustrious fellow-citizen. His name is for ever associated with the Abolition of Slavery, but we shall discover that he was a man of very wide sympathies, bringing a remarkable influence to bear upon the country as a whole, through his many-sided activities.

Said Boswell, describing an election meeting in the Castle Yard at York, at which Wilberforce spoke as a candidate: "I saw what seemed a shrimp, a mere shrimp, mount upon the table, but as I listened, he grew and grew until the shrimp became a whale!"

Sir James Mackintosh remarked: "I never saw anyone who touched life at so many points—and this is the more remarkable in one who is supposed to be absorbed in the contemplation of a future state!"

One of the last letters John Wesley wrote, addressed to Wilberforce, gives us a clue to the secret of his influence. "My dear Sir, Unless the Divine Power has raised you up to be as Athanasius, 'contra mundum', I see not how you can go through your glorious enterprise in opposing that execrable villany which is the scandal of religion, of England, and of human nature. Unless God has raised you up for this very thing, you will be worn out by the opposition of men and devils. But if God be for you, who can be against you? Are all of these together, stronger than God? Oh, be not weary in well-doing. Go on in the power of His Might, till even American slavery, the vilest that ever saw the sun, shall vanish away before it. That He who has guided you from your youth up, may continue to strengthen you, is the prayer of, Dear Sir, your affectionate servant, John Wesley."

Without a consciousness of divine leading, he never could have done what he did. As one of his sons expresses it in his biography: "His Christian faith was from first to last, his talisman of happiness. Without it, the buoyancy of his youthful spirits led to frivolous waste of life, not more culpable than unsatisfying. With it, came lofty conceptions, an energy which triumphed over sickness and languor, the coldness of friends and the violence of enemies, a

calmness not to be provoked, a perseverance which repulse could not baffle. To these virtues was owing the happiness of his active days. Through the power of the same sustaining principle, his affection towards his fellow creatures was not dulled by the intercourse of life, nor his sweetness of temper impaired by the irritability of age. A firm trust in God, an undeviating submission to His will, an overflowing thankfulness, these maintained in him to the last, that cheerfulness which this world could neither give nor take away. They poured upon his earthly pilgrimage the anticipated radiance of the land of promise. 'The path of the just is as the shining light, which shineth more and more unto the perfect day'." This is a typically nineteenth-century description, but we cannot miss the point of it all.

Sitting in six consecutive parliaments, he fulfilled forty-five years of public service, twenty-eight of them as Member for the City of Hull. In a House that counted Pitt, Fox, Burke, and Sheridan amongst its members, he held a front rank both as speaker and debater. Pitt said, "Of all the men I ever knew, Wilberforce has the greatest natural eloquence".

Along with singular devotion to duty in the House, he combined a deep personal activity in watching the welfare of individuals who came under his notice, as well as sharing in the launching and maintaining of charitable and philanthropic institutions. Amongst these might be mentioned, A Society for the suppression of Vice, The Sierra Leone Company, A project for the education of missionaries, The Church Missionary Society, The London Missionary Society, The Christian Observer, The British and Foreign Bible Society, and The Royal National Lifeboat Institution. These constitute but a few of the many interests of his life. And we must not omit to mention the book he wrote, whose full title is, *A Practical view of the prevailing religious system of professed Christians, contrasted with REAL Christianity.*

He was a great correspondent and it is largely due to this fact that so complete a picture of the man is available for us to-day. Five sources are drawn upon for the *Life* which his sons wrote:

(*a*) His Diary (of daily occurrences).
(*b*) His Journal (of private religious reflections).
(*c*) His Correspondence.
(*d*) Manuscript memoranda (of dictated notes).

(*e*) Conversational memoranda (memorized notes of his sayings, etc.).

Having got the background, let us now sketch in the details of this long, full, and useful life. He was born in Hull on 24 August 1759, the third of four children and the only boy. He was small in stature, feeble of frame, but he had a vigorous mind and an affectionate temper. At an early age his powers of elocution were remarkable, and to the last he retained this wonderful gift. He survived several illnesses and an accident, and eventually died peacefully, a month short of his seventy-fourth birthday.

His ancestors had long been settled in the county of York, the township of Wilberfoss, eight miles east of the city of York, providing a mansion and a name. One branch of the family came to Beverley in the East Riding in the middle of the sixteenth century. A Wilberfoss became Mayor of this town and his great-grandson became Mayor of Hull in the following century, changing the name from Wilberfoss to Wilberforce. He was engaged in the Baltic trade, his son becoming a partner in the firm. This son, Robert, was the father of William, the hero of our tale.

William commenced his schooling at the Hull Grammar School, at seven years of age. Two years later, on the death of his father, he went to stay with an aunt and uncle at Wimbledon. At twelve years, returning to his mother in Hull, he continued his education at the Pocklington Grammar School. Proceeding to St John's College, Cambridge, he took his B.A. in 1781. His M.A. followed seven years later, the reason for the long interval being due to his refusal to assent to certain articles of the Church which he had not fully thought out! It was at Cambridge that he met Pitt, and there began an intimate friendship which lasted until the latter's death in 1806.

During his stay at Wimbledon, his natural affection responded to the kindness of his aunt and uncle who, it should be stated, were Methodists. During his holidays at home, his mother noted with alarm the tendency of "her William" to become a "bigoted, despised, Methodist"—and took steps to remove him from such dangerous influences. The habits of Hull society assisted her design, and soon he was immersed in a ceaseless round of balls, theatre visits, suppers, and card parties. "This mode of life was at first distressing to me", he tells us; "but by degrees I acquired a relish for it and became as thoughtless as the rest. My voice and love of music made me acceptable at all places."

But a change came, and in later days, when he largely withdrew from the society which he had charmed in his youth, his chief female friends were Hannah and Martha More, Elizabeth Fry, and Maria Edgeworth. What a change from the days when the society he frequented included Mrs Siddons, Mrs Crewe, Mrs Sheridan, the Duchess of Portland, and last, but not least, the beautiful and bewitching Jane, Duchess of Gordon!

How did this change come about? He had gone up to York to spend his twenty-fifth birthday at the races, and whilst there, arranged to take a continental trip with a friend (who later became Dean of Carlisle). He never once read prayers on the trip, but he would not suffer religion to be lightly treated in conversation. Wilberforce spoke of a certain mutual acquaintance and described him as one "who took religion and religious things 'too far' ". His friend took him up on this point and eventually convinced Wilberforce that he was not taking things "far enough". Thenceforward he became a changed man and the entries in his diary bear witness to the change. Instead of such entries as this,

> Dec. 6th [1783]—Dined Hamilton's; opera; supped Burlington House; Mrs. Sheridan sang angelically—

we find,

> Oct. 25th [1785]—Began to get up very early—read Bible—meditation for one hour.

He tried all means of discipline and gradually, the peace and contentment of a life hid with God, became his in ever fuller measure. Someone accused him of being "deranged" since his conversion to evangelical Christianity, but another retorted, "Well, if he is deranged, I hope we shall all become so".

This perhaps is an opportune moment to refer to his relationship to Methodists and Methodism. He remarked John Wesley's arising with a giant's strength against the apathy of his day, but goes on to say: "His mission was chiefly to the poor, and his methods tended to foster a sectarian spirit. There was needed", he continued, "some reformer of the nation's morals, who should raise his voice in the high places of the land, and within the Church and near the Throne, do what Wesley had done in the meeting and among the multitudes." (Professor Coupland says that this is the prejudice of his Romeward-moving sons, colouring the attitude which Wilberforce was supposed to have taken with respect to Dissenters.) Eventually,

Wilberforce took this as a personal call and responded by instituting a Society for the Reformation of Manners; for years keeping the idea in mind, in the midst of all his activities. (Had he been born at the beginning instead of towards the end of Wesley's life, there might have been no Methodism, but instead, an English Reformed Church!)

In 1789 the following entry appears in his diary: "Called on John Wesley—fine old fellow." With the Wesley family, Wilberforce had formed a personal acquaintance, at the house of Mrs More. "I went to see her in 1786, and when I came into the room, Charles Wesley rose from the table, and, coming forward to me, gave me solemnly his blessing. I was scarcely ever more affected." His respect for Charles is shown in a yearly pension he allowed his widow. Here is an interesting note. In recommending one of the "Wesley comets", Wilberforce had no thought of encouraging dissent, for John Wesley was no dissenter from the Church, nor were any of his preachers suffered, during his lifetime, to attempt to administer the sacraments of the Church. Had he not considered them as Churchmen, he would not have suggested their employment, for in the same year, he dissuaded a relation of his who complained that in her place of residence she could find no religious instruction in the church, from attending the meeting-house. "Its individual benefits", he wrote, "are no compensation for the general evils of dissent. The increase of dissenters always follows from the institution of unsteepled places of worship, and is highly injurious to the interests of religion in the long run." There speaks Wilberforce the loyal Churchman. Not that his loyalty was blind. He was always ready and anxious to see any question from all possible points of view, and his one desire was to do the right even if it meant cutting across the conventional. What hurt him more than anything else, was a spirit that in any situation, brought discredit on religion. He always tried so to act that his good might not be evil spoken of. As an instance of his catholicity, note this entry in his journal. "Resolved to go to town for the sake of the Methodists." The occasion was as follows. Sunday drilling had just been introduced into the Channel Islands and was offensive to the religious principles of Wesleyan Methodists. Their refusal to comply subjected them to fines and imprisonment. They appealed to Wilberforce, who took the matter up and eventually got it settled.

We have already referred to the encouragement he received from John Wesley when he gave himself to his great life work, the Abolition of Slavery. Before considering this, just two brief references, one to his book, and the other to his domestic life. He was so possessed with the desire to experience *real* Christianity, and see it spread throughout the land, that he undertook to deliver himself upon this subject, and as a result, his book, *A Practical View*, was published, challenging the comfortable assurances and self-complacency of the people of his day. It had a circulation without precedent, running into fifteen editions and several impressions; it was widely read in India, and was translated into French, Italian, Dutch, Spanish, and German. Not words but deeds; not profession, but practice; not creeds as such, but inwrought into the very texture of life—for such he pleaded. It was really the logical working out of the situation he faced when with his friend Milner, he had argued about "taking things too far". Wilberforce reproached himself with being "too timid a Christian", but his work and influence bear a different witness. Towards the end of his life the dominant note was one of wonder and gratitude to God for using him in the way he had.

There was a time when he said "The outlook is so dark and foreboding that I dare not contemplate marriage". However, he did marry, and had six children, living to enjoy the innocent pleasures afforded him by contemplating the antics of mischievous grandchildren. He survived the death of his two daughters, and spent the evening of his life alternately in the homes of two of his sons. Three of them took Holy Orders, one becoming a Bishop in the English Church, the other two moving over to Rome. One of his greatest joys was to have his children and theirs around him, relaxing from the rigours of the duties to which his conscience bound him. How he entered into the games and fun!

> 1815—Twelfth night—we asked the N's—all played blind man's buff—read Waverley—some chess.

In the summer he went excursions with them into the country. "We went out for the day, took our dinner with us, 14 in all," wrote a friend "Mr Wilberforce made us all very happy." "Here", he broke off in the midst of a letter to Hannah More, "I am irresistably called to a contest at marbles—so I obey the call." How delightful these little glimpses are.

A strange entry appears in his diary, "canistered—and to House". Another entry offers a solution—"Ate cold meat out of canister—as good a dinner as could be desired". Similar entries continue to appear frequently—and the dates intimate that it was during the heartbreaking years of the Abolition struggle!

To this all important subject we must now turn. In order to bring it within measurable compass, let us select a few outstanding dates, quoting his diary, and letting our imagination fill out the picture.

Wilberforce's abomination of the slave trade was made known in his fourteenth year, whilst still at the Pocklington Grammar School. In that year, 1773, he wrote an article and sent it to the press at York; It was "In condemnation of the odious traffic in human flesh".

Seven years later, during his first year as a Member of Parliament, he asked Mr Gordon to collect information for him regarding the traffic, as it operated in Antigua.

In 1786 he was requested to move in the House for abolition. He consented, and as a first step an Abolition Committee was formed, with Granville Sharp as Chairman and Clarkson assiduously collecting evidence. Wilberforce's diary is full of references to committees, interviews, and correspondence. Meantime, opposition from vested interests was increasing. At length, in 1790, the question came before the House. Wilberforce opened the debate with a speech lasting three-and-a-half hours, of which Burke said, "It equalled anything I have heard in modern times, and was not perhaps to be surpassed in the remains of Grecian eloquence". Planters got the decision deferred. Wilberforce's residence was more like an hotel than a home, for people were calling at all times, discussing the business, poring over papers, etc. The following year, after reviewing the evidence, the motion was brought up in the House again, but lost! Seven years later, the following entry appears in the diary:

1798 *Annual motion* for Abolition again lost.

What does not that term conjure up in our minds? Cynicism, scorn, apathy, condescension obloquy, misunderstanding, misrepresentation, slander, and estrangement. All these, and threats of physical violence too, were his lot. How true those words of Wesley were, in the letter we quoted almost at the commencement of this article. And so it went on until 1804. In that year he moved the first reading of a bill to abolish the Slave Trade, and was complimented by an

opponent on his ingenuity in finding some new arguments on so hackneyed a subject. The opposition failed and the Bill was carried by a definite majority. During the next few years other countries took similar steps. In 1823, the Slave Trade being abolished by law as far as the influence of England extends, Wilberforce published his *Appeal Against Slavery*. Ten years after, the Bill for Emancipation of the Slaves was carried. The second reading was taken just before Wilberforce died. He knew all was set fair, and died content. "Thank God I have lived to see the day when England is willing to give £20,000,000 for the abolition of slavery." The bill was passed a month later.

Over thirty years of unremitting toil, before the goal was reached. That in itself is a tribute to the character of the man.

We cannot do better than close with the words of Kathleen Simon in her book on Slavery, published in 1933, the centenary of the Abolition:

> Wilberforce was not the first to put forward the ideal of trusteeship for the backward races, *but he was the first to put it into actual practice*. He impressed upon the world a new tradition of trusteeship to backward races and a responsibility towards the weak, whose fate lay in their hands. And that tradition has never died. His great achievement was nothing less than a great ethical revolution which has transformed the moral basis of the relations between Africa and Europe.

THE DOCTRINE OF GRACE [1]

C. B. ARMSTRONG

WILLIAM OF OCCAM, the recalcitrant fourteenth-century English Franciscan, bequeathed to theology an instrument which has been too little used—namely his razor, a logical weapon, *Entia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitatem*, which being loosely translated means: "Is this entity really necessary?" I hope to apply it here to a complicated area of theology in the entanglements of which some of you may now be involved, and to try to cut away some dead wood to ease your progress.

The area is the Christian doctrine of Grace. During your studies here you have been or will be concerned with the ramifications of this doctrine, and perplexed by the many controversies which have raged round what might well be called its ecclesiastical machinery. There is not, I hope, much prospect of your trying to interest a modern congregation in the views of St Augustine, John Cassian, and Duns Scotus on the subject, or on the controversies centring on Molina or Jansen: and even in your private studies I expect you may feel a sense of unreality when you try to distinguish between Actual, Habitual, and Sanctifying Grace, or attempt to subdivide Actual Grace into the categories "operating", "cooperating", "prevenient" "sufficient", and "efficacious".

The grace of God in an active and effective sense is utterly real: but I am suggesting that the elaborate theology of Grace developed in patristic and scholastic circles from St Augustine onwards was based on a conception of Grace as an entity which is no longer tenable, whether a substance, as in the idea of the Treasury of Grace, or a power operative only through the proper channels. Grace is neither analysable nor canalizable. It is the beneficent assistance of God, stemming from the Incarnation and Atonement, and experienced by Christians of all ages. It is God being active towards us in loving help, or graciousness.

When loving help is given by one person to another, the donor does not give a thing nor does the person assisted receive a thing. What happens is that the assistance given enables the person helped to do more than he could have done unaided. His understanding

[1] A Lecture delivered at Cuddlesdon Theological College on 7 March 1958.

may have been enlightened or his difficulty overcome by the help, but he does not receive a thing or a power to keep as his own: the help given may enable him to suceed on his own later, or he may need its renewal from time to time. But the assistance does not become part of his personality nor can he keep it for subsequent use, though he may know where to look for it if he needs more later. God may be gracious or merciful to a sinner again and again, but the grace or mercy is not transferred to the sinner as a possession or power: they have to be sought on each subsequent occasion. This does not mean of course that there is not a realm of Grace, an area within which God's graciousness or mercy operates effectively. I am only at the moment asking that grace be not regarded as a thing or a power given.

Again we do not separate the love of a father for his child as a something between father and child by means of which he operates on it. No more, I would suggest, can we separate the graciousness of God as experienced by us his children as something between us and him, given into the distributive control of the Church. It is quite a different thing to say that his graciousness normally comes to us through appointed means, from saying that there is a power in the means themselves; for example God uses the Bible as a means of communication to those who use it with devout intention, but there is no power latent in the Bible itself. The Bible is holy in the sense of *hieros*, inspired by vision of God and set apart for God by its writers and the Canonizers of the Church, but not in the sense of *hagios*, indwelt by a power of holiness. The latter idea leads to its superstitious use. Similarly Faith is the activity of trusting and believing, and not the means of believing, as St Augustine seems to think when he writes of the men of Tyre and Sidon "It was not granted to them to believe, and therefore the means of believing was denied them".

The cause of such hypostatizing or making a substance out of Grace was mainly linguistic. Adjectives arise from a subjective evaluation of objects or events e.g., by grunts of satisfaction or "ughs" of abhorrence. When similar reactions are felt by other people they become stabilized as adjectives like good, hard, ghostly, and so on. These adjectives are applied to the names of things which have become common nouns, for the purpose of communicating judgements, such as "Beef good". An adjective when attached to numbers of different nouns seems to indicate a quality common to

them: these qualities become abstract nouns, brittleness, justice, and so on. Some such adjectives indicate real spiritual qualities, like graciousness, or mercifulness, and are applied only to living beings who are said to possess this quality. And it is in this connection that error arises. Abstract nouns denoting personal qualities can only be defined in activities as when St Paul says Charity suffereth long and is kind, envieth not, is not puffed up. etc., and when Plato defines Justice or *dicaiosune* as doing your own duty and not interfering with other people. But the next step is false, and Plato was partly responsible for it: the quality is hypostatized, given imagined reality as a substance. It is regarded as a thing or a power, and described on the lines of a thing or power by other adjectives whereas it is really a convenient class-name for certain types of activity.

Thus the graciousness of God to man is seen principally in the atoning work of our Lord. His graciousness finds its supreme expression in the Atonement. But, instead of this, the Atonement is itself conceived as generating a something called Grace which is put, as it were, at the disposal of the Church of God, though always proceeding from him. This same something may, according to some Roman theologians, be generated by the merits of the Saints. It is regarded as a thing emanating from God or a power by which God operates on man. It was a kind of Mana which God and his Church could control and use: it was a mysterious power whose workings man ought to understand as well as gratefully accept. It was, as I have said, thought to be a something generated by Christ's atoning work, a consequence of what he did. Whereas the opposite is the case: what he did was generated by the divine graciousness and a consequence of it. This power was envisaged as bequeathed to the Church, to be somehow disseminated through the Church's organization, though of course always emanating from God. Later on it was regarded as being at the disposal of the Church only, and only by the authorized channels. And the effects of grace on persons became "graces", *gratiae donatae*. But to say for example that St John Chrysostom was endowed with the grace of eloquence means only that his natural gift of eloquence was enhanced by its dedication to God's service, just as *all* our natural gifts can be, by the help of God.

The conception of Grace as a power or gift in God's control, or, by his delegation, in the control of the Church, led St Augustine and later theologians to the conclusion that, if it be such, it can be

granted or denied. The explanation of why some believe and others do not was then that God gives his prevenient grace to those whom he has predestined to believe in order that they may be able to believe. They are, as he says in the *De Dono Perseverantiae* C.35, "Separated from the mass of perdition by the predestination of Grace".

Many Christians have revolted against the idea of such a selective activity of God: but it springs logically from a false conception of Grace. If grace is a "thing", albeit a spiritual thing, if such is possible, it must either be given or not given: if Grace is a power, albeit a spiritual power, if such is possible, it must either be applied or not applied; and if, as must be, this power or thing originates from God, either he, or his agent the Church, must decide to give it or withhold. And the Church was perhaps over-ready to act as custodian of the realm of Grace, and to define and constrict its mode of operation.

Is Grace then one of the entities on which Occam's razor should operate? In all religion we are concerned with the activity of the living God. To hypostatize aspects of his activity as substances or powers is to multiply entities and brings with it the danger of dividing what is essentially one, and of seeking to control what is essentially uncontrollable. Our age is learning to think not in terms of substance and power but of observed activity patterns. To understand the *cause* of these recurrent patterns is an attempt which scientists theoretically have more or less abandoned: in our case, knowing, as we do, by revelation and Faith that God is active and omnipresent in his world, we know the origin of the patterns of his activities towards us, and we know their general pattern which is constantly recurring. We know that his help is normally given through a pattern established by our Lord and in an organism the Church which he founded, and through specific means which he established or sanctioned.

Thus far we can go. But we cannot analyse completely, define exhaustively, or particularize exclusively the modes of his activity. They depend indeed on one supreme revelation, but not on one finally understood revelation, or final documentation. The living God cannot be shut up in a book, or confined in a systematized institution. The definition of Grace in the recent *Dictionary of the Christian Church* is "the supernatural assistance of God bestowed upon a rational being with a view to his sanctification". But God's

assistance to man is always supernatural and always with a view to our sanctification. Man has never been able to achieve sanctity without it; the doctrine of the Fall means, at least, that we cannot, in the words of the tenth Article, "turn and prepare ourselves in our own natural strength and good works to faith and calling upon God". But we have also been endowed with free will, which can prevent us from so turning, but theoretically could also decide us to turn. The old theologians would have surmounted this impasse by the idea of prevenient Grace applied by God to those whom he wills to be saved, with predestinarian results. But I think that a truer conception of God's graciousness will provide a truer solution.

The initiative is God's: I feel sure that St Augustine and others have been right in safeguarding that. But the initiative is not in the form of a distributed gift. What is needed is something, some activity of God which will awaken in our souls the desire for holiness and cause us willingly to seek his aid, which is always available. And that prevenient activity of God must not be selective, or else we are driven to that desperate expedient of St Paul in Romans 9, the Potter and the clay, a passage which does not seem consonant with his general theology and which, as Professor A. M. Hunter says, "every lover of St Paul must wish that he had never written".

What activity then of the living God is now and always, generally and preveniently working to awaken the desire in us for sanctification, which at once receives his gracious aid. There can be only one answer which does not compromise the reality of human freedom. It is Revelation. Wherever the gracious love of God and the abounding glory of God is truly revealed the effect is to draw men to desire of holiness. The Old Testament Revelation was primarily of the glory and the New Testament primarily of the love, though they interpenetrate one another, and the revelation of God in them, though unique, is not exclusive of lesser revelations prior to, and subsequent to, that of our Lord. Revelation is not explicable in terms of substance or Power: it is essentially personal and spiritual. It is richest where the full light of the glory of God is shining in the face of Jesus Christ: when he is lifted up men are drawn unto him. But it is always shining, generally offered to all men, and yet relying on those who have eyes to see and will to show it forth in word and deed. The Church is the chosen instrument of spreading the illumination through all the world, and the Eucharist is the focal point of the Church's showing forth. For therein the glory of atoning love is

revealed, and to man's condition this revelation of God's graciousness is pre-eminent. Our redemption is an eternal event, a salvation pattern pervading history and recurrent in countless souls. The initiative is always God's, for it is his graciousness to sinners that is always being revealed. The response to that graciousness is caused by its own light which brings illumination and attraction. Men, all men, are to see it, and the Church's primary task is to make it known and show it forth in the context of God's glory by life and worship. We are to carry on our Lord's task of revealing God, of showing him to the world. The Church was founded for that by the Master, and provided with means by which our revealing work might be perennial. We are as Christians in the full glow of the divine revelation, and our Bible, our preaching, our sacraments, and our ministry are means by which the graciousness of God is revealed. We are in the area and tradition of the full illumination: but without its continual shining in and through living Christians of each generation of the Church, individually and corporately, the light of the glory will fade, at least from our witness; for the Church has no possession of, or vested interest, in a thing or a power called Grace.

PASTORAL PSYCHOLOGY [1]

NORMAN SMALL

MOST PEOPLE are willing to forget—if they ever knew—that about half the hospital beds in this country are occupied by those who are mentally ill. It has been calculated that one in every twenty people in this country will consult a psychiatrist sooner or later. The present figures will undoubtedly increase, and the problem is of such gravity that every priest and minister of religion ought to study the means whereby he can give useful help in this situation. Pastoral Psychology is the study and application of such techniques as will enable us to give real help to those in distress and disorder of mind. Note the word "Psychology". It can never be "Psychiatry", for this is the study, diagnosis, and treatment by a *medical specialist* of mental illness. The word "Pastoral" stresses the fact that these techniques can be used usefully in our normal pastoral work. While it will perhaps always be true that there will be specialists in Pastoral Psychology, my object is to try to give you certain pointers so that you may spot trouble *early* in your own people and recommend the right course. It is always worth remembering that much good First Aid consists of "doing nothing—efficiently", and this is very true in this field. Well-meaning interference can do a great deal of harm and in some cases can lead to the gravest results—but that ought not to mean that we are to shirk our jobs. We may not try to be amateur "do-gooders" or amateur lay analysts, but if we can keep our eyes and ears open and keep in mind certain diagnostic points we can do no positive harm; and it is more than likely that we shall be able to do a great deal of good. But we must always realize our limitations—something perhaps not too easily achieved by parsons, for we who have been given Eternal Truth to teach may fall into the pit of thinking that we know everything about everything. We may even talk wisely about "Religious Mania", but it just does not exist; though many mental illnesses are "coloured" with religiosity. We may say to someone, "Read your Bible and say your prayers", but there are so many who can do neither. We may say to someone else, "You ought to

[1] A paper read at the Eastern Command Chaplains' Conference at Bagshot Park, on 8 January 1958.

make a self-examination and some sort of confession", perhaps finding to our horror afterwards that that person has committed suicide. And while the advice about self-examination and confession is so good in many cases, it is inviting suicide in a great many others. The great difficulty is to know which is which. I believe it is true to say that many potential suicides could have been avoided if, say, a parson had known something of what was going on and did the right thing. This right thing is always to act in the closest co-operation with the doctor, and to use our persuasive powers on the patient *and on the relatives*, so that treatment is not delayed. Quite apart from anything we can do, the fact that we can point out, with all the influence we possess, that mental illness and treatment as an out-patient or as an in-patient is not a disgrace, but that it is the only right and wise thing to have, is most valuable. A mental hospital is not an asylum where people are shut up year after year in horrible conditions. It is a hospital where all the staff are trained to cope with mental illness and where the right equipment is to be found for their use. A mental hospital is no more *odd* than a fracture clinic. If we can stress this when the need arises, then we have done a great deal of good—and probably far more than we shall ever know. The climate of opinion is changing and there is much that we can do to change it more rapidly.

But let us take a case and see what we can do about it. A man we know comes to see us. He looks very miserable—rather like a bloodhound with a headache or a whipped spaniel—and he tells us that he has committed many sins, though, normally, he does not say what they are. He says that God has forsaken him and that this is not surprising, for his wickedness makes him quite unfit to expect anything else. He tells us that he has lost all zest for life and that his appetite has gone. He may tell us that his sexual appetite has gone too. He will almost certainly say that he is making everyone miserable. We ask him to tell us exactly *why* he is so miserable, but usually he cannot tell us. He is just tired and unhappy and guilty. He looks and complains of being tensed up.

All this time we have been listening, and we tend, as parsons do, to fasten on the word "guilt". Now here is something we can claim to know something about; and it is just because of this that we may say and do the wrong thing. We do not say anything about the guilt and the unworthiness, but we do ask him how he sleeps and how he feels when he wakes up in the morning. If he says that he

wakes up very early, about four or five o'clock, and lies in bed until it is time to get up, chewing over his guilt and his inadequacies, the thoughts of which go round in his head like squirrels in a cage—beware. You will probably find out that although he looks so unhappy, he does not go off into a long description with many tears (though he may); and you may, and probably will, discover that he finds it hard to concentrate on what you are saying. He seems to be "sunk in himself" and much preoccupied with himself, but there seems a singular lack of appropriate emotion and of speech. Well now: what are you going to do? Are you going to deal with his guilt and his unworthiness or are you going to continue with your quiet and kindly questionings? I would, at this stage, ask two further questions, the answers to which are of the utmost importance. These questions are classics and I can never understand why some audiences find them so amusing.

The first question is this. "What would you feel like if you thought you were going to die to-night?" Keep your eyes on his face, for his reaction is important. If he gets into "a bit of a state" about it, you may perhaps breathe a little more freely: but if he seems to brighten up momentarily and ask you, "Do you think there is any chance of that happening?" and if he asks it as if dying to-night would be a ray of hope, you ask the second question. It is both short and simple: "How are you going to do it?" It has been my lot to ask that question on many occasions and I can, even now, never get over the cold shiver a positive answer brings. One such man said to me, "I am going to crash my car. Everyone will think that it is just an accident and there will be no disgrace to my family. I have brought them enough hurt and trouble as it is." A woman once fished in her handbag and produced sixty grains of sodium amytal—blue bombs—which she had been saving up. You have found someone suffering from endogenous depression and your line of action is clear. Forget about the guilt and the unworthiness, take charge of the sodium amytal or see that the man does not drive home, *and get in touch with the doctor at once.* The man must have medical treatment at the earliest possible opportunity, and you must do all in your power to see that he gets it. There is not the slightest need to bandy medical terms about and to tell the doctor that this man is suffering from endogenous depression. Just tell him simply that the man has tremendous feelings of guilt and unworthiness, that his sleeping is disturbed, and

that you know positively that he is contemplating suicide. Go home with the sick person—nothing else matters now and other things have to go by the board—for he can so easily kill himself if left alone. If he knows you pretty well and trusts you, so much the better. If he is a member of your congregation, that is better still. You are his parson and his friend, and although at this time he thinks that God has forsaken him, you have not. It will be all to the good to foster this relationship as much as you can. Get him home safely, get a doctor to him, and then deal with the relatives—and God be with you in that. Tell them that he must go into hospital, that he will probably have Electro-Convulsive Therapy (E.C.T.), and that his prospects are good. There have been many suffering from endogenous depression who, to my knowledge, are now not only very well, but better than they have ever been. This disorder of mood (for that is what it is) is commonly found in the over-conscientious person and often in the climacteric—but there is no *rule* about it. Play for safety all the time.

Supposing, on the other hand, you forgot all this and start dealing with the guilt and the unworthiness, what will happen? You may get some sort of confession there and then—and it will probably be his last. If you suggest self-examination soon and confession soon he may start on the self-examination, but it is highly improbable that he will be alive to make his confession. Now all this goes against the grain with us, and let no one accuse me of being biased against confessions. I hear over a hundred every year in my little City church and have personal knowledge of its worth.

I have dealt with endogenous depression at some length because it is common and easily missed. The patient does not appear to be "odd" or insane. Perhaps he seems to be "run down" in more ways than one. But before I leave it, let me explain that endogenous depression is a depression which comes "out of a clear sky" with no obvious precipitating factors. Further, let me add that when the man is in hospital, your job is in no way finished. Go and see him in hospital. It will do him good and will do you no harm. Let him see that someone cares for him and is standing by him. The word, of course, is *agape*. Be quietly confident about the outcome and do not let him or the relatives worry if he complains that his memory is bad. This will right itself in due time. Tell him that, very confidently, reminding yourself that E.C.T. is given to many whose memory is of the greatest importance—doctors, parsons, barristers,

and accountants, for instance. You may find that E.C.T. may be given in an outpatient department of a hospital. If it is, there is no reason why you should not go to fetch him home.

You may find that E.C.T. works like magic: on the other hand a relapse may come later. There is no reason why there should not be more E.C.T., and there are many drugs which are given with great benefit. There is always a great deal of hope, and that hope, I think, gets greater as every year passes.

There are other kinds of depression—indeed there are times when we all "get the blues", but we get them for reasons which are easily seen. We go down and we bob up again in time. Our Mrs Mop leaves, or we have a row with a church official, or the choir goes on strike, or, having spent the money already we discover that Uniform Upkeep Allowance is a £1 less than it was, or we get a "rocket" from the Bishop—all these things make us depressed: but we have a "Reactive Depression" and, quite naturally, we come out of it. There are depressions found in connection with anxiety states, with nameless fears and dreads, but these will probably not lead to suicide. Ask the two classic questions of a neurotic and see the response you get. There will be floods of tears and "poor little me" coming out quite unmistakably. You can often use your ministry in a more normal way in these cases but you will need all the patience and understanding you can obtain through the Grace of God.

We now pass on to another serious mental illness which often comes on earlier and in a most insidious way. Schizophrenia is the most common disorder which leads to admission to mental hospitals, and although it is often (and perhaps unfortunately) referred to as "split personality" let it be said once and for all that it has nothing to do with Jekyll and Hyde.

You may find someone who starts to complain that he is being talked about by other people, or that he is hearing voices which tell him to do certain things. I remember seeing a letter written to the Central Electricity Board by a man who lived on the South Bank of the Thames. He complained bitterly that when the fires were stoked, the smoke which came from the chimneys was a signal to his enemies and that the electricity generated at the power station was giving him evil and lustful thoughts. This letter was thought to be very funny by those who received it, who merely laughed and said, "Another nut". It was shown to me and on my advice was

taken to the Medical Officer, who did not think it funny either. If that man had come round to the power station to put a stop to the smoke signals and to the electricity which gave him lustful and evil thoughts, someone might easily have been seriously hurt, or even killed. Sometimes persecution is thought to come from Jews or Freemasons—Hitler leaps to the mind here—or sometimes there is a complete disharmony between mood and thought, showing a deterioration of the personality. A person will say, "My dog was run over yesterday"—and giggle. Another may say, "I always have to wear black socks when there is coffee for breakfast", or make similar bizarre statements. I knew a man who, at times, said he was our Lord, and walked round wearing a crown and a red robe. The things to look out for are hallucinations—voices, the influencing by X-rays, radar, Freemasons, Jews, and the like, bizarre statements and delusions. There is a progressive withdrawal from the world of reality into a world of fantasy and it must be said, regarding the ideas of persecution, that they are sometimes logical and systematic—if you accept the main premise. Again, get the person to a doctor, for there will probably have to be in-patient treatment, sometimes as a matter of urgency.

There is another illness about which I ought to say a little, and this is obsession. Now we all of us had certain obsessions when we were young—lines and squares, smelling everything we picked up, or touching every other lamp-post in a street, but these attitudes are usually outgrown. It is not always the case, however. There may be a tendency to wash the hands repeatedly, to go up and downstairs repeatedly, to have certain ceremonials attached to life which make life a complete misery. There may be awful thoughts which haunt and which will not go away: obscene and blasphemous pictures arising in the mind, such as the Host being covered with excrement. You often find, if you look at someone's hands, that they are raw with being scrubbed dozens of times during the day. We are reminded of Lady Macbeth—"Will these hands ne'er be clean?" But it is not just a question of the uncomfortableness of raw hands. Such an attitude can cost a man his job. He leaves home to go to work and has to come straight back to wash his hands again—and he just never gets to work, or gets there very late. Or perhaps he has not touched every other lamp-post because he saw a bus and ran for it. He gets on the bus but has to get off again, go back home, touch every other lamp-post, and start off again for work. Although

there may be, and probably is, something important for us to do at a later stage, I believe we shall be ill-advised to meddle. Obsessionals are a job for the expert, for usually the basic trouble lies very deep indeed.

There are other forms of mental illness upon which I shall not dwell, chiefly because there is not the time. There are the neuroses, the conversion hysterias (in which mental and spiritual distresses are "converted" to physical illnesses), the psychopathic personalities, and so on. But again, these people need skilled handling and we may not try our 'prentice hands at any kind of analysis, and for the following reasons. If we have not been analysed ourselves we shall unconsciously and unwittingly tend to project all our own inner and unconscious difficulties on to the person we are trying to help, and give him even more to bear and to deal with. Analysis can also uncover a good many "sleeping dogs" which are better left asleep, unless we know exactly what we are doing. We shall, in these cases, tend to do the patient and ourselves grave disservice. Analysis is comparable to a major surgical operation, not lightly undertaken by anyone, and it often costs the earth. It is not half so common as most people imagine.

Treatment is not a matter for us, but for the psychiatrist. Certain treatments are physical—E.C.T., Insulin shock therapy, leucotomy —and there are various drugs which are of the greatest value—e.g. Largactil. That being the case, let me put in a word here about the Christian psychiatrist. Many people ring me up and say, "Do you know of a Christian psychiatrist?" when the accent ought to be more, in some cases, on the word "psychiatrist" and not on the word "Christian". I refer here to treatment, often physical, given as a matter of urgency. What is important is the competence of the psychiatrist and not his religious beliefs or lack of them. Questions of analysis are different, of course, but even so, the top-flight psychiatrist will "care" for his patient too much to do violence to his religious beliefs. Of course, I would that all psychiatrists were Christians, and indeed that all men were so; but when we are faced with emergency we must give priority to the competence of the psychiatrist, for physical treatments can be administered as competently by a non-Christian as by a Christian. Do you choose your dentist primarily because he is a Christian or because he is a good dentist?

I said that analysis was not as common as many people suppose; but psycho-therapy is very common indeed. There is much we can do in the way of simple psycho-therapy—and "psyche" does mean "the soul". I have known cases of severe paralysis, peptic ulcers, blindness, and the like clear up after medical and spiritual treatment given in co-operation. Very often, when you come down to it, it is basically a question of an unquiet conscience: but it may not be. It may be something physical—and that is why there must always be a physical examination by a doctor. It is no use trying to deal with paralysis along the lines of a conversion hysteria when all the time the person is suffering from Parkinson's disease; and it is no use assuming that because a person suddenly says he cannot see that he just does not want to see: he may have a detached retina. But all the same, there was a man sick of the palsy who needed his sins forgiving, and we may like to ask ourselves what it was that St Paul just could not bear to "look at". We must not assume too readily that everyone who suffers from a peptic ulcer has a shocking conscience—he may well have—but we serve no useful purpose by going up to, say, a churchwarden, digging him in the ribs and saying with a sly grin, "And what have you been up to, you old dog?"

It is always wise for us to remember that there are quite a number of physical illnesses which look like mental illnesses. If you have ever seen anyone with D.Ts. you will know what I mean—or with General Paresis of the Insane (G.P.I.)—which always follows on syphylis. Again and again we come back to the same thing: there *must* be co-operation. I am quite certain that this will not come as of right, so to speak, but rather in this way. You happen to know a doctor: he likes you and trusts you as a parson. He likes you and trusts you enough to feel pretty sure that you realize your limitations and will not make his patient worse. Doctors have, thank God, a high sense of responsibility towards their patients and will not lightly hand suitable ones over to a parson (with the patient's permission, incidentally) who is likely to do harm—and this is easily done. But the whole field of psycho-somatic medicine is now receiving such prominence that doctors are usually only too thankful when they can find a priest or minister of religion who is both willing and able to provide for their patients something which is invaluable—the wholesome medicine of the Gospel. But let it *be* wholesome and not the "safe in the arms of Jesus" variety, which seems to me to be neurotic in the extreme. Instead there is the

quiet confidence which comes of a true and living faith, the sense of being part of the Family of the Church, the faithful and regular reception of the Sacraments, and the greater awareness of God which comes from the regular and systematic practice of meditation. I cannot stress this enough, for I believe it is of the utmost importance—and particularly in the case of old people who often feel lonely and unwanted. This is, of course, a question of pastoral care, but we must remember that the population of this country is getting older as the years go on. People do not die so early as once they did, and we must give heed to this problem before it gets beyond us.

Let me, finally, recommend a book which I reviewed recently in the *Church Quarterly Review*.[1] It is called *Religious Factors in Mental Illness* by Wayne E. Oates, Professor of Psychology of Religion and Pastoral Care at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in the United States (Allen and Unwin, 16s.). This book cannot be recommended too highly, even though I had to criticize it on the ground that the Sacraments are never mentioned; but there is so much good in it that I beg you to buy it. When you have bought it, *study it*. Let me commend to you the chapter entitled "Healthy and Unhealthy Religion" and let me quote a few extracts from other parts of the book. An example is given whereby "a woman was hospitalized in a few days through the co-operation of her church, her family and her doctors". He goes on, "Through quick detection of her earliest symptoms her pastor [note that] enabled her to get early psychiatric treatment and in two months she was back in her home and at her work". He tells of those "who received real help from a combination of shock therapy, re-educational psychotherapy and religious counselling". Please note the order, for it is important.

I trust that before long, every theological student will be given lectures in Pastoral Psychology as part of his course in Pastoralia, but whether it comes sooner or later, there is much we can do now.

[1] Vol. CLVIII, No. 329 (Oct.-Dec. 1957), pp. 545-7

A MOVEMENT IN CLERICAL EDUCATION

T. F. TAYLOR

Our approach to reality "depends on our presuppositions, which in turn depend on our training";[1] and institutions are a large part of training. About fifty years ago Tout fruitfully turned from the story of England's constitution to the examination and history of the institutions or organs of English government where developments are at times encouraged, at other times smothered. There have been many histories of the Christian clergy for better or worse, but no full account of how they were trained and equipped, or in what ideas and lines of thinking they had been moulded. (Only one English book[2] covers the ground—but very cursorily, passing from Samuel's training of prophets to the present day in fifty small pages.) But it would be of intense interest and importance to have a full survey of clerical formation at different periods, showing the moulds of thought that influenced generations of students who can all too easily carry unchanged and undusted throughout their ministry only what they brought down from college. In this long story of many fashions one crucial period was the seventeenth century, when the break through to modern (pre-atomic) times took place. For the understanding of this period *The Scholastic Curriculum at Early 17th Century Cambridge* (1958) by Fr W. J. Costello, S.J., of Gonzaga University, is of great value. He has minutely studied the subjects then followed and his very full list of manuscript sources—notebooks, exercises, and students' letters, etc.—is of immense help. (It is good to learn that he plans to publish more on the decay of the scholastic diet, its compromises with the New Philosophy, and the newer more radical departures from the old system, until it dwindled to the late eighteenth-century formality, when the candidate for his B.A. being asked *Quid est nomen?* regularly answered *Nescio*, thus abandoning the doctrine of universals as insoluble.)[3]

With much detail Fr Costello proves that until 1660 the old studies continued from medieval times with identical methods and largely similar content—a conclusion not yet appreciated by those who continue to see the Reformation as the great divide. Great as was Bacon's authority there are hardly any traces of his influence

on university philosophy or methodology after his death. No new logic followed the lines described in his *Novum Organum*.[4] Nor did Renaissance humanism make much difference to university studies except in purely classical fields. Aristotle, Lombard's *Sentences*, and the Schoolmen were kept in honour and daily use.

In spite of many inherent drawbacks this persisting system had some telling advantages. The scholastic disputation called out from the student active participation in the process of learning, gave him a maturity and poise often noted in contemporary biography, and made a fairer and more effective test than a written examination (Costello, p. 24). In a deeply divided Europe it greatly helped to maintain an appreciation of both Catholic and Protestant theological thought. Students and teachers even more were well acquainted with medieval and Counter-Reformation authorities (pp. 81, 83n, 108, 122). Jesuit writers were closely studied and St Thomas Aquinas, whom Dr John Preston "the greatest pupil-monger in England" read at the barber's, was an ordinary source for both dons and pupils. But the attention paid was not indiscriminate. Reynolds, Field, and Abbot lectured notably against Bellarmine; and Montague wrote to controvert the history of Baronius. However formal and almost irreverent the disputations and exercises might appear at their worst, the curriculum sharpened and deepened a real concern for truth. Logic-chopping genuinely searched for truth (pp. 51, 54). Fallacies and misleading short cuts were detected and it was the plodder not the quibbler who learned best. Men exercised themselves strenuously (and with wit) on great theological topics. Out of a random selection of fifty-one questions twenty-one were of grace, justification, and free will; four of the ministry; four of the papacy; four only of the Eucharist; three of eschatology; three of the cult of images; six of moral theology; and seven miscellaneous (p. 113).

But there were also serious weaknesses in the scholastic tradition. First, in attempting to handle the sensible world with logical neatness, in their too single-minded devotion to Aristotle, the late scholastics would squeeze and trim everything into the Master's categories. The method was too narrowly aprioristic (pp. 101, 49). It attempted to keep physics, a sturdily expanding science, under metaphysics by ignoring new areas of knowledge (p. 146). This was its final undoing, for astronomy gave a greater shock to medieval thought than Luther or any Reformer caused.

> And new Philosophy calls all in doubt . . .
> And freely men confesse that this world's spent,
> When in the planets, and the Firmament
> They seeke so many new.[5]

The new utilitarian philosophy of experience abandoned the old doctrines of substantial purposive forms and the hierarchy of being. When material properties were accepted as *the* basis of study, indeed of existence, an exact system of measurement was demanded. There had to be a vast cosmic reduction to one calculable level. Men in the old tradition had habitually asked Why? but the new men went after the How? of construction. What was most unsettling was that the new way diffused its standards with bewildering swiftness; the revolution was carried through in two generations. Secondly, arising in part from this *volte face*, but in some measure actually contributing to it, was the lack of teachers, and great teachers make a university. There were few masters who could meet the new evidence and think out a larger synthesis. On the continent too only a few like Suarez attempted restatement, but most theologians, Protestant and Catholic, "tragically entangled themselves in splicing wires and complicating circuits". Frequent tunings of the professorial chair and purgings under James I and the Commonwealth brought much loss—more to Cambridge than to Oxford. These successive purges from Mary's reign till the Restoration divided and degraded the teaching body.[6] Further, although the seventeenth century had good tools of scholarship (for example, in a far more competent knowledge of Greek), these instruments were badly used after 1660. There were few good theological insights—the universities fell back in reputation while the non-conformist academies for about a century surpassed them.

Much of the academic confusion in late seventeenth-century theology (which was to lead to eighteenth-century indolence) might have been spared if theology had not remained the apex of academic studies. At that eminence it was threatened when the preparatory studies of logic and philosophy were being unsettled. Wise Baxter seems to have had the remedy from pastoral considerations: "It is a grand error . . . that they study the Creature before the Redeemer, and set themselves to Physicks, and Metaphysicks and Mathematicks, before they set themselves to Theology: when as no man hath not the vitals of Theology is capable of going beyond a fool in Philosophy. . . . Their pretence is that Theology being the end, and

the most perfect, must be the last, and all the subservient sciences must go first: But . . . . It's evident therefore that Theology must lay the ground, and lead the way to all our studies."[7] But there were precious few to agree with Baxter and perhaps the late Fr Herbert Kelly of Kelham was the only effective person with the same vision.

Fr Costello does not raise all these points, but has summarily and most usefully given the picture of Cambridge education. But he seems to fail to give it proper depth. Puritanism was not simply in intention or meaning anti-Catholic. In some important respects it was influenced by Ockhamism—every happening and significance being due simply to God's will, which was above reason and past searching out. Again, there was very little Lutheran influence in England after the dispersal of the Little Germany group at the White Horse Inn, Cambridge, except in 1560-8 and 1639-50. There were only five or six writings of Luther translated;[8] and among the few teachers who had a close knowledge of Luther, William Whitaker, Master of St John's, was a convinced Calvinist. It was Calvin who was the greatest single influence until the 1590's when Baro and Barrett swung away from the absolute decrees. In this reaction or advance, so easily but inadequately called Arminianism, was expressed a genuine attempt to reach towards the wholeness of revelation, Catholic truth. There was a wonderful period of patristic studies (witness the great Eton edition of Chrysostom in 1612) which was maintained for a time by the Puritans after their separation from the established Church. Cambridge scholarship in Greek was high from 1600-50 and this might have opened a way to a more catholic theology than the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries had achieved, for late medieval thinkers had shrunk from many traditional questions, failed to accept any large view to include both faith and reason, and by removing all effective standards of judgement were left with an unknowable God.[9] Fr Costello fails to underline sufficiently how much the Bible was *the* source *par excellence* of theologizing. The most tangible sign of this readjustment was the conviction of the Marian exiles on their return home concerning a discipline of life and learning founded on Scripture. Earlier royal injunctions to Cambridge (1533) had with bland official ease required all divinity lectures to be based on Scripture "according to the sense thereof and not after the manner of Scotus". But it was the Elizabethans who made the very text a real witness and judge. Inevitably therefore the doctrine of justification was central

—but was it intrinsic to the soul itself or an extrinsic imputation of Christ's righteousness? In this debate or search Anglican preachers were not totally against Trent and all for Protestant doctrines. Bancroft resisted first the consequences and then the substance of Beza's theology. With difficulty there arose and grew in Anglicanism a real reconciliation of Protestant and scholastic elements. It was in striving towards this that Cambridge defended the Church's doctrine against the Millenary Petition. But it was sheer loss that this necessary and costly reconciling work was hindered by failure to teach Church history well, for the past was seen too much only as a corpus of cautionary tales and horrible precedents.

Yet the continuing scholastic curriculum did great things. It wonderfully raised the level of the English clergy. The parishes of Elizabeth's early years had mostly only "poor ignorant mechanicks" to shepherd and instruct them. Knowing the shortage of priests. their exact condition and bad equipment, Elizabeth thought one preacher would be enough for a county. In a royal audience to some bishops and members of Convocation in 1584 Whitgift said it was impossible to have learned ministers in all the 1300 parishes. "Jesus," exclaimed the Queen, "1300! It is not to be looked for . . . My meaning is not you should make choice of learned ministers only, for they are not to be found, but of honest, sober, and wise men and such as can read the Scriptures and homilies unto the people."[10] The patient, steady labours of Whitgift to raise and maintain the standard of clerical understanding were matched by the thorough and orderly training where precisely the old curriculum and methods excelled. Naturally there were misunderstandings and difficulties. In 1584 a petition to Parliament pleaded for advanced research at Cambridge in order to have a body of experts and dictated answers.[11] But the bishops wisely were against the proposals then; they wanted no controversy and were of the view that it would be fatal to preached divinity. But their lordships came near to the danger of making Oxford and Cambridge into mere seminaries. It was a wise arrangement therefore that although bishops visited colleges they did not control the universities. Certainly the system was too narrow, and restricted change and adaptation. Laud's important Statutes for Oxford in 1636 would if strictly followed have maintained elaborate disputations and ancient texts for ever. But England, unlike Hagar, has never been

in bondage. The letter remained (and still to some degree remains to-day), but there came a new spirit of understanding.

It did not happen in a flash. The hold which Aristotle and the old system possessed had been slipping for half a century. Even by 1584 there were many dispensations at Oxford from the disputations. Both Bacon and Milton rebelled against Aristotle, and although few people had all their bile, there was an increasing retreat from the doctrines and methods of the schools. In the 1620's Samuel Fell turned from the Schoolmen to the Fathers, but in the 1650's Isaac Barrow, dissatisfied with Aristotle, went to Bacon and Descartes. More than any one else Dr Wilkins, Warden of Wadham 1648-59, protected and spread the New Philosophy. And as Aubrey reported, "If a new philosophy is brought in, a new divinity will shortly follow"; and he was right.

So it happened; teachers after some initial fumbling (fortunately there was no united clerical opposition to the New Philosophy) worked to present God's saving truth in concepts and language understanded by their contemporaries. But it will all one day be set in its context and related in orderly progression when that comprehensive history of clerical training is written—a project which won the approval of that greatly loved scholar, Claude Jenkins, whose wisdom matched his learning. Let us hope that the work (which will surely need to be a co-operative undertaking) may appear soon. Beyond all doubt there will be plenty of economic motives and factors in the story, but there should be room too for this nice fragment of medical history—how several outbreaks of the plague cancelled commencements, generally relaxed the obligation to attend scholastic functions,[13] and brought to an end an auld sang.

1 B. Willey, *The Seventeenth Century Background* (1934), p. 3.
2 J. E. Roscoe, *A Short History of Theological Education* (2nd ed. 1949).
3 D. A. Winstanley, *Unreformed Cambridge*, p. 57.
4 W. R. Sorley in *Cambridge History of English Literature*, VII. p. 276.
5 Donne, *The First Anniversary*, II. pp. 205-11.
6 G. N. Clark, *The Seventeenth Century*, p. 292.
7 *The Reformed Pastor*, pp. 267-9.
8 G. Rupp, *The Righteousness of God*, pp. 42-4.
9 G. Leff, *Medieval Thought* (1958), pp. 260, 290.
10 J. E. Neale, *Elizabeth I and her Parliaments 1584-1601* (1957), p. 71.
11 Strype, *Annals*, III, bk. II. App. no. 40. Ed. 1824.
12 *Brief Lives*, ed. A. Clark, I, p. 201.
13 Costello, pp. 4, 198n.

CORRESPONDENCE

MATINS AND ANTE-COMMUNION

SIR,—Your contributor, the Reverend J. A. Thurmer, has written truly liberating words. The recognition that the Reformation scheme of Matins-Litany-(Ante) Communion is no longer workable, that the present arrangement of "Early Communion" and either "High Matins" or "High Mass" militates against the pastoral ideals of the Liturgical Movement, that the "Choir Offices" of the Prayer Book are not in original intention "monastic services" but "people's services" all indicate that at last we begin to cast off the shackles of the romanticizing and archaeological "First Liturgical Movement".

Indeed, the whole history of that Movement has been one of "tinkering" by all schools of thought. It will no longer do. What we need is one, and only one, "family service" for the Sunday morning, giving weight to Word and Sacrament, lasting one hour and no more, remembering that perhaps the majority of clergy have to serve more than one parish. If that service is to preserve the "land-marks" of our existing public worship there will have to be not only severe "condensation" involving sacrifices, especially of hymns, but that Liturgy must be an *organic* whole.

If so, we cannot be content to deal with Matins and Ante-communion alone, but must consider the whole rite. There is one item which has not been dealt with at all: the "penitential section" both in Matins and Holy Communion. Is not this a "landmark" belonging to our Prayer Book pattern? But if the "penitential section" is retained in its present place in the *Missa Fidelium* from which then the Intercession has been removed, we find it wedged between the Offertory and the Canon. Is it there in an "organic" place? Before we decide anything we must ask some fundamental questions. What, in either case, is the function of this section? We have no pre-Reformation history to guide us, except that it was sometimes part of the Prone especially in Germany. A liturgical function, it obtained only in Reformation services. And that function is invariably one of *preparation*. Within the Prayer Book pattern it would seem that the "penitential section" in the Choir Offices prepares for the reception of the Word, while in the Eucharist it prepares for the actual reception of the Sacrament as the wording of "Ye that do truly" and its position in the rite of 1549 make abundantly clear. Now, is it more necessary to prepare penitentially for the reception of the Sacrament than it is for reception of the Word? Is the reading and preaching of the Word without sacramental value? No truly biblical theology can be in doubt about the answer. But we cannot have two penitential preparations in the one-hour Sunday morning service and I would suggest therefore that it be deleted from the Eucharist and placed at the beginning of the service, foregoing all introits, processional hymns, etc.

After either a Scripture text proclaiming the holiness of God in whose Name his people gather, or part of the introduction to the Swedish

Mass: "The Lord is in his holy Temple, his Throne is in Heaven, yet He is nigh to them that are of a penitent and contrite heart. Let us therefore in confidence approach His Throne of Grace and confess our sin and guilt", the people kneel and say the General Confession: "Almighty and most merciful Father." The Absolution is either that of the Offices, the Eucharist, or a shorter one, followed by: Salutation, Collect of the Day, "O Lord, open Thou our lips", short Psalm *de tempore* (an excellent selection in the "Introit Psalms" of *A Proposed Prayer Book*, Church of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon, 1951), Lesson (Short O.T. and Epistle, combined), *Benedictus* (or *Te Deum*, on feasts), Gospel, Nicene Creed, Notices, Sermon, Intercessions, in whatever form, Offertory (with text *de tempore*, a fairly long hymn, and Prayer, as in South African rite, but with an ecphonesis leading to *Sursum Corda* and Preface).

The ceremonial is a separate subject, largely depending on the posture of the Celebrant (eastward or basilican) and the extent of the participation of the laity. The vesture will, at least for some time, continue to depend on "Churchmanship" and local custom, but if chasubles are worn, they should be worn throughout the service without any unseemly putting on and off for any part of it.

Windhoek, S.W. Africa. W. VAN DER SYDE

REVIEWS

CHURCH AND MINISTRY

CORPUS CHRISTI: THE NATURE OF THE CHURCH ACCORDING TO THE REFORMED TRADITION. By GEDDES MACGREGOR. Macmillan. 30s.

DR MACGREGOR has written this book as a contribution to the discussions now taking place between Anglicans and Presbyterians and it is admirably suited to the purpose. For, in the first place, he never tries to assist the cause of unity by indulging in vagueness or ambiguity; on the contrary, he does all that he can to clarify and sharpen the essential features of the Reformed tradition so that the basic points at issue may stand out as plainly as possible. And secondly, while firmly loyal to that tradition, he shows himself ready and eager to scrutinize it both for undiscarded relics of medievalism in decay and also for the abandonment of genuine Christian insights as a result of over-violent reaction from medieval abuses. There is a good deal in this book with which most Anglicans will disagree, but there is very little for which they should not be grateful.

The book opens with a discussion of the medieval background, and of the Calvinism both of Calvin and of the Reformed Scottish Church of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Specially valuable is the author's demonstration of the extent to which at the end of the Middle Ages thought about the Christian religion and the Church was dominated by canonistic and legalistic rather than by strictly theological concepts; it would be most interesting to know whether there was any causal connection between this and the nominalistic and voluntaristic emphasis which infected theology itself. The treatment of Calvin is profound; a most interesting suggestion is made that Calvin, by a methodological error, was less successful in his discussion of predestination than St Thomas had been. "By bringing predestination into the definition of the Church one falls inevitably into a great error. Predestination is outside the temporal order; the Church is within this" (p. 49). This is indeed a radical criticism and it might seem to imply that the error was more than merely methodological.

The historical section of the book is followed by a systematic account of ecclesiology. The New Testament notion of the *ekklesia*, the Incarnation, the Body of Christ, the Eucharist, and the Episcopate are expounded and discussed; these chapters would provide excellent material for group study by members of the Anglican and Reformed confessions. All that can be attempted here is to underline some of the issues that seem to be involved.

In the first place, the Reformed or Calvinist doctrine is seen to be sharply contrasted not only with the doctrines of Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy but equally with those of other forms of Protestantism. It is shown that the Reformed view of the Church is radically different from the "Separatist" view of the Church as "gathered"; it is shown also that on such central themes as the

Incarnation, the relation between God and the world, and the Church itself, Calvinism is basically opposed to Lutheranism. If Lutheranism insists that *finitum non est capax infiniti* and Calvinism that *finitum est capax infiniti* (p. 148), there would seem to be as fundamental a difference between the two systems as could well be conceived; any Anglican will, I think, find himself wondering how the Reformed Churches manage to maintain relations of intercommunion with the other Protestant bodies at all. Certainly it is clear that Anglicans will be making a bad mistake if they think that they can simply negotiate with a single entity called "Protestantism", for when one gets down to the basic issues the different Protestant bodies are seen to be almost as much at odds with one another as any of them are with Catholicism; it is only the widespread decay of the sense of dogma in recent years that makes it possible for us to overlook this fact in the island in which we live.

The chapter on the Body of Christ is excellent for the way in which it shows, from a careful linguistic and biblical survey, that the understanding of the Church in the light of this concept is more than the application of a suggestive metaphor. The chapter on the Eucharist which follows it is admirable for its author's readiness to deplore the wholesale rejection of the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice by the reformers; on this topic there is little with which any Catholic will disagree. The following passage from a later chapter is significant:

> What is unfortunate in the wording of the *Westminster Confession* is that it makes it appear as though nothing really happens in the Eucharist because everything has happened already, so that we are not to be allowed to do anything but pay homage to the memory of this. The Westminster divines, in guarding against the danger of reversion to the attitude that had engendered the Mass ("abominably injurious to Christ's one only sacrifice"), used language that fails to draw attention to the indubitable need and duty of the Church to participate in the work of its Lord, according to the peculiarly intimate relation in which, at his bidding, it stands to him (p. 247).

This is indeed a brave criticism. However, it is unfortunate that Dr MacGregor is not equally ready to reopen the question of the presence in the eucharistic elements; like D. M. Baillie in the posthumous work *The Theology of the Sacraments*, he fails altogether to see that there is no necessary contradiction between the presence in the *elements* and the action of Christ in the *event* of the eucharistic action, which is what the phrase "the Real Presence" denotes in Reformed theology. There is certainly cause for both astonishment and thankfulness in the recovery of the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice in Protestant theology; where much work still remains to be done is on the nature of the sacrifice and still more on the nature of the presence.

The chapter on the Episcopate is frankly puzzling, and it is unfortunate though perhaps understandable, that it is in his discussion of this burning question that Dr MacGregor for the first time fails to be completely clear. He is explicit that the ministry is something

given by the Christ to the Church and not something devised by the Church for itself, but he shrinks from the full consequences of this assertion. Thus he writes:

> The ministry "flows" from the Head, and the ministers participate in the current that has that divine Source. In participating in the current of Christ's gift to the Church, the individual ministers have a "togetherness", a "corporateness"; but ordination admits them to participation in the flow of the gift, and cannot be said to "incorporate" them into anything, as Baptism incorporates the neophyte into the Body of Christ. This means that while the ministry is the divinely bestowed episcopate, its organisation is a matter of human ordering in the sense that it has only the duty to organise itself as efficiently as possible for its ministration (p. 225).

This hardly seems to be coherent, but the whole chapter merits the closest examination. My own impression is that it is when it comes to the Eucharistic Presence and the Ministry of the Church that the Reformed tradition falls away from the courageous realism of its great basic theses; this is, however, one of the questions that need close study before a confident answer can be given. Dr MacGregor insists that "there is no place in the Reformed tradition for any ecclesiological view that does not do justice to the continuity of the Church" (p. 239), but I am not quite sure that he does justice to it himself.

One particular point may be stressed. It is commonly supposed that the institution of "elders" is fundamental in Presbyterianism; Dr MacGregor insists that this is not so. In "the last resort the responsibility for the right administration of Discipline lies with the ministry. . . . The eldership is a most useful institution; but it is not a divine gift to the Church and it is by no means indispensable" (p. 216). Thus the suggestion in the 1957 Anglican-Presbyterian Report that, if Presbyterians were prepared to accept some form of Episcopacy, Anglicans might be prepared to institute some form of Eldership, while it is ingenious, does not seem to be theological.

In conclusion, it must be repeated that Dr MacGregor has written an important, penetrating, and courageous book which merits serious study by Anglicans. However, a great deal of its effectiveness will depend on the extent to which its argument is endorsed by his fellow-Presbyterians.

E. L. Mascall

STATE OWNERSHIP EXAMINED

Nationalisation in Britain: The End of a Dogma. By R. Kelf-Cohen. Macmillan. 25s.

Mr Kelf-Cohen aims to give a careful account of the growth of the idea and practice of nationalization in Britain. His story begins with the socialist ideal of securing for the worker the full value of his labour by eliminating the exploiting capitalist. He then stresses the

impact of Fabian ideas, and, in particular, the contribution of the Webbs, before turning to Mr Herbert Morrison's suggestions for the public ownership of transport and to the history of the national corporations under the Labour government. He stresses the lack of formal planning prior to the passing of the acts. Mr Shinwell had to produce at short notice an organization for the coal industry under public ownership; and most of the bills were crude, sketchy, and unsatisfactory.

The author deals in turn with the different enterprises. He contrasts the high hopes entertained by the supporters of nationalization of coal and rather depressing results. He scorns the expectations of a change of heart among the miners and contends that the nation has been too indulgent. When output per man hour has been increased through costly mechanization, increased absenteeism has prevented output per man from rising. And the miners, by constantly pressing for higher wages, are compelling the helpless consumer to pay higher prices.

Mr Kelf-Cohen goes on to consider the nationalization of transport. He depicts it as a hopelessly overwhelming task for the Transport Commission—a small group of five men "of advancing years who were quite incapable of controlling the enormous transport system of Britain". Despite the rundown condition of the railways after the war and the low priority of investment, the supporters of nationalization continued to speak of the transformation in efficiency which would occur under public ownership. That they were disappointed Mr Kelf-Cohen has no difficulty in showing. His main criticism is that it is impossible to create a vast organization overnight when an industry has taken a century to develop.

When he turns to the Central Electricity Authority the author complains of over-expansion. He argues that schemes have been carried out on the advice of naturally enthusiastic engineers, and that the exceptional conditions of the post-war period were wrongly regarded as normal.

Nor is the Gas Council spared. It has been unrealistic in its approach. And the results have been wasteful. And as for Iron and Steel, the less said the better. The industry, so we are informed, had an excellent history and the case for nationalization was entirely doctrinaire.

It is disappointing that Mr Kelf-Cohen makes no real attempt to deal with the central issue of the pricing policy of public enterprise, apart from a brief mention of reforms in electricity tariffs. He argues that both the consumer and the taxpayer are overburdened. But he does not consider how far the nationalized industries should be regarded as a social service, that is with low prices and losses financed through taxation, or how far as commercial enterprises, charging higher prices and earning profits to finance development and provide incentives to management. Unless this matter is considered first it is difficult to decide such questions as conditions under which public corporations should obtain external finance.

Stressing the degree to which nationalization has fallen short of the ideal of its supporters is not necessarily useful. What is relevant is the extent to which public ownership in practice represents an advance over the preceding capitalist organization. This question Mr Kelf-Cohen hardly considers. The mere fact that public ownership has not fulfilled the expectations of the idealists does not itself imply that nationalization has been a failure.

Mr Kelf-Cohen argues that nationalization of coal has benefited only miners. Yet it seems likely that under private ownership the miners would have been better off than under the National Coal Board with its present pricing policy. In view of the persistent shortage of coal during the postwar period, a privately owned industry would have been able to charge high prices and make considerable profits. Hence the miners would be in a strong position to claim higher wages. Mr Kelf-Cohen pleads for more responsibility among miners and their leaders on the grounds that attempts to increase coal production through mechanization have been foiled through a rise of absenteeism. It would seem that the problem would be more easily solved by granting substantial bonuses depending on regularity of attendance rather than by moral exhortations. Indeed Mr Kelf-Cohen's analysis of the attitudes of the British miner is extremely confused. Thus we are told that "the miner has always regarded a low standard of living as natural in the industry" and yet he is also pressing for "more and more concessions to enable him to keep up his position as the best paid worker in British Industry". No explanation is provided for this remarkable lack of consistency.

And Mr Kelf-Cohen should have second thoughts about the steel industry. The suggestion that the growth of steel production under the Labour government was impeded by the threats of nationalization can scarcely be supported by available data. Thus steel production increased no less rapidly when nationalization seemed imminent, that is 1947 to 1951, than in the following period when the threat was removed. But that imports had to be considerably higher in the latter period owing to the shortage of steel under private enterprise and that this makes it desirable that the industry should be publicly owned, is not considered by the author.

Nor does Mr Kelf-Cohen allow for the change of outlook among the workers. It is true that coal, like many other things, used to be cheap; the price was not paid by the consumer but by the workers who received disgracefully low wages and often lived in appalling conditions. To-day the workers will no longer tolerate such a position.

Although Mr Kelf-Cohen's book constitutes a formidable challenge for the politician who advocates nationalization, it is far from satisfactory looked at from the Christian viewpoint. Efficiency, low prices, and profits cannot be ignored in economic debate, but ultimately the Christian will want to know whether one set of circumstances, rather than another set of circumstances, is more or less compatible with the demands of human dignity and with the implications of a Christian society. Time alone will show whether a socialist state can eliminate the

evils that have sometimes characterized capitalism and which brought misery and degradation to millions.

✠ MERVYN SOUTHWARK

OLD TESTAMENT STUDIES

A CRITICAL INTRODUCTION TO THE OLD TESTAMENT. By G. W. ANDERSON. Duckworth. 12s. 6d.

FROM THE DEATH OF SOLOMON TO THE CAPTIVITY OF JUDAH. By A. W. HEATHCOTE. James Clarke. 6s.

THOSE students and teachers who have wanted to keep up with the latest conclusions of Old Testament scholars have been having a difficult time. The information they sought has been, for the most part, buried in technical articles or foreign books. Now they will be greatly indebted to Professor Anderson for his excellent book which, in a short compass and with admirable clarity, reviews all the latest critical work on the Old Testament. Here they will be able to find out all the things they want to know, for instance: what Pederson and Engnell have said about the Pentateuch: what Gunkel and Mowinckel have said about the Psalms: what views are held on the composition of the book of Ezekiel. Apart from the Pentateuch, which is dealt with as a whole, each book of the Old Testament is surveyed separately and there are chapters on the Canon, literary forms and their history, and the Old Testament as Christian scripture. Yet though most of the book is taken up with description of the work of modern scholars, this is not done with uncritical enthusiasm. The results of the work of the older scholars is not brushed aside or neglected. Nor is the impression ever given that all the problems they left unresolved have now been solved. The result is a really judicious book which will become an indispensable text-book for all students for some years to come.

Mr Heathcote's book is one of six called the London Divinity Series written as text-books for candidates preparing for the G.C.E. examinations in Divinity. The first three volumes will deal with the Old Testament, the rest with the New Testament. This particular book is the middle one of the Old Testament set. It is interestingly written with abundant biblical references. Each chapter ends with questions which could form the basis for a discussion or written work. There are several maps and four plates. Unfortunately the plate of the excavations at Hazor is printed upside down.

J. ROBINSON

OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY

THE LIVING WORLD OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By BERNHARD W. ANDERSON. Longmans. 30s.

OF THE making of popular books on the Bible there appears to be no end. Some of these are good, others less good. The book under review is

in a class by itself and must be enthusiastically recommended to all teachers and students of the Bible. It represents a rare achievement and justifies the American Council's (Religion in Higher Education) initiative in launching the writing of this book. The format keeps to a high standard, chronological charts, maps, and illustrations abound and are of a high quality. The price for this very long (and heavy!) book of 550 pages is astonishingly low.

Anderson approaches Israel's sacred history with scholarly objectivity and theological conviction. He unfolds and evaluates the evidence, investigates the channels of oral and written transmission, and brings out the revelatory content in the tradition. Though he writes with a light touch he never dismisses the problematic interaction of these and other formative factors in the making of the Old Testament.

Unlike Noth, who begins with Israel in Israel, Anderson accepts the historicity of the Patriarchs and of the Exodus. For the latter, and indeed throughout, he follows Albright's dating (shortly after 1290 B.C.). He accepts the traditional account of the crossing of the Red Sea around Lake Timsah and the Sinai-Horeb site in the desert peninsula. He retains the miraculous and supernatural aspect of the victory and mentions rationalizations only to show how unsatisfactory they are; on the other hand he stresses the literary history behind the tradition. Thus the reader follows a good guide through the centuries of Israelite development down to the Christian era.

Professional teachers will no doubt be most interested in the author's treatment of notoriously difficult and even controversial issues. On Ex. 3. 14 he inclines more to God's evasive withholding of an answer than to a direct "I cause to be what is". On the meaning of *nabi'*: the prophet is one who communicates the divine will, ecstasy being an orgiastic property which was assimilated from outside. On Isa. 7. 14: Isaiah announces the *timely* birth of a child to a "young woman" of marriageable age and this Immanuel child of the house of David will share the nation's privations and the refinement of the remnant. The Law Book of Josiah is found in Deuteronomy (12 to 26), but in form and content shows dependence on an old legal tradition and northern provenance.

These examples may suffice to show that Anderson follows roughly the middle stream of Old Testament scholarship. At the same time he is always aware of more daring views and whets the reader's appetite for a more detailed analysis of the biblical text. There is now no more excuse for the continuance anywhere of out-of-date or ill-informed Old Testament teaching.

U. E. Simon

BOOKS ON THE OLD TESTAMENT

I

Men Spake from God. By H. L. Ellison. Paternoster Press. 10s. 6d.

This book is a brief introduction to the prophets written from the conservative evangelical point of view. The prophets are dealt with

chapter by chapter in their supposedly chronological order and Daniel is included among them as a prophet of the Babylonian exile. Mr Ellison's aim, to encourage people to read the prophets for themselves, is wholly admirable and certainly anyone reading the prophets with this book by their side will be helped to a clearer understanding of obscurities in the text and thought, but far too much of the writing is concerned with counteracting the conclusions of the critics. This inevitably means that in a book of this size the evidence cannot be fully reviewed and so the final impression is one of dogmatic asseveration rather than reasoned conclusion. Occasionally this dogmatism leads to conclusions which those who do not share the author's viewpoint can only regard as pure nonsense. For example, in discussing the position of the psalm of thanksgiving in Jonah 2, Mr Ellison maintains that it is original because a historical Jonah from the whale's belly is thanking God for saving him from drowning. "Even a landlubber like Jonah knew that this was no ordinary fish." Those who can swallow that will be able to gain profit from this book. The rest must look elewhere.

J. Robinson

II

The Old Testament in Hebrew. Edited by N. H. Snaith. British and Foreign Bible Society. 17s. 6d.

Following closely on the heels of the Kilpatrick edition of the Greek New Testament, the British and Foreign Bible Society have now issued this new Hebrew Bible to replace the Letteris Bible which they have published for many years. The decision to publish a new Hebrew text was taken as long ago as 1933 and the long subsequent delay is due to wartime difficulties and the lengthy task of proof reading. This new text is not a revision of the old but a new, independent text based upon the readings of the first hands of certain Spanish Hebrew manuscripts which are in the British Museum together with the Shem Tob manuscript. Dr Snaith thinks that these texts preserve the true Ben Asher tradition. No Masorah is given and the only footnotes are the official Massoretic notes. The Sedarim and Haftaroth are indicated and a table of Sedarim and corresponding Haftaroth for all sabbaths and special days according to the customs of both Ashkenazi and Sephardi Jews is added as an appendix.

This is a very handsome and well-bound Bible and both editor and publisher are to be congratulated on a fine piece of work. The consonantal text is large and clear and the pointing easy to read. The result is a text which it is a pleasure to read and a volume which is not at all cumbersome but on the contrary a delight to handle. It is in every sense a real bargain.

J. Robinson

III

The Latter Prophets. By T Henshaw. Allen and Unwin. 30s.

Mr Henshaw has provided us with a useful handbook to offer to

students beginning their study of the Old Testament prophets. His book meets a real need because while there are not a few Introductions to the Old Testament, the student has previously had to consult several books to discover the historical and religious background, and the findings of archaeology, with which he ought to be familiar. Now with one exception, all the basic information he needs is available for him within the covers of this one book. As the title makes plain, Mr Henshaw deals with the books contained in the second part of the second division of the Hebrew Bible, the three major and the twelve minor prophets. The greater part of the book is devoted to an examination of each of these prophets under the following headings; the life and character of the prophet, the contents of the book, the unity of the book, its permanent influence, and its style. A chapter each is allocated to Proto, Deutero and Trito-Isaiah and chapters 9 to 14 of Zechariah are dealt with separately from the rest of the book. All this is preceded by four very useful chapters on the historical background, the archaeology of the period, the origins and nature of prophecy, and the forms and characteristics of Hebrew poetry. Finally, the book is rounded off with appendices on the priesthood, sacrifice, the Messianic hope, the Hebrew calendar, feasts and fasts of the Hebrew year, weights and measures, various chronological tables, and a bibliography.

In spite of this very comprehensive approach, there are a few omissions. For instance in the bibliography there is no mention of *The Interpreter's Bible* or of Pritchard's *Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament*. George Adam Smith's classic commentary receives no mention under Isaiah, as it surely ought to. More seriously, the introductory chapters are overweighted with historical background to the virtual exclusion of religion. This neglect of religion is the exception to which reference was made earlier. There ought to be an additional introductory chapter on the religious background of the prophetic books describing Israelite religion and the Canaanite influences which the prophets fought so hard to exclude. In this chapter use could be made of archaeological material at present neglected (for instance, in the chapter on "Archaeology and the Prophetic Period" Ras Shamra is never mentioned), and the burning question of the relationship between the prophets and the cult could be brought to the student's attention.

This exception apart, Mr Henshaw's book achieves all that it sets out to do. It should prove to be of very great value to theological students and school teachers.

J. Robinson

OLD TESTAMENT BACKGROUND

Documents from Old Testament Times. Edited by D. Winton Thomas. Nelson. 18s.

Bible students in general have cause to be very grateful to the Society for Old Testament Study. To the three volumes already published under

the auspices of the Society—*The People and the Book*, edited by A. S. Peake (1925); *Record and Revelation*, edited by H. Wheeler Robinson (1938); and *The Old Testament and Modern Study*, edited by H. H. Rowley (1951)—has now to be added the present volume designed to mark the forty years existence of the Society. Although the Society is one of the so-called learned Societies, it was the express wish of those responsible for the publication that this selection of non-biblical documents illustrative of the Old Testament should meet the needs more particularly of teachers of Scripture in schools, the clergy, and all others who are not professional scholars. Professor Winton Thomas is to be congratulated upon the success of his work as editor. To have produced such an attractive and uniformly valuable aid to the understanding of the Old Testament is no mean achievement.

The documents here presented are arranged in five groups. First come the cuneiform texts, including extracts from the Epic of Creation and the Story of the Flood, the Code of Hammurabi, the Tell El-Amarna Letters, and the Ras Shamra Tablets. Next we have Egyptian documents, including nearly half the Stele of Merenptah and a selection from the teaching of Amenemope. The third group consists of a single document, the Moabite Stone, discovered some thirteen miles east of the Dead Sea and commemorating the victories of the Moabite king, Mesha, over Israel. The fourth group consists of Hebrew documents and includes the Siloam Inscription and the Lachish Letters, as well as seals, weights, and coins. The last group is a collection of Aramaic documents, including some of the Elephantiné Papyri. The editor's Introduction points out that although the documents are thus grouped together on a basis of script and language, they belong to different types and are differently related to the Old Testament.

Twenty scholars have assisted the editor, their contributions to the symposium conforming to a general plan, each translation being prefaced with a short introduction and followed by notes and a bibliography. The translations are in all cases freshly made from the original documents. There is a useful chronological table, and sixteen half-tone plates add to the value of this compilation.

As the preface makes clear, "the aim throughout the volume has been to relate each document as closely as possible to the Old Testament and to bring out relevant points of interest touching history, chronology, archaeology, religion . . . in illustration of the Old Testament". This has been done, and well done, in the conviction that the material here considered supplements the story of Israel told in the Old Testament and contributes to a better understanding of the history and of the life and thought of Israel in the setting of the peoples of the ancient Near East. This book will be sure of a large sale, the more so as it is priced at a figure which in these days seems most moderate.

C. Witton-Davies

JOB INTERPRETED

FROM TRAGEDY TO TRIUMPH: STUDIES IN THE BOOK OF JOB. By H. L. ELLISON. Paternoster Press. 10s. 6d.

THERE are a variety of approaches to the book of Job. We may, for example, approach it as a masterpiece of literature (or, more precisely, of dramatic poetry): or we may think of it as a religious document, concerned to probe, if not to solve, the mystery of human suffering: or, again, we may regard it simply as "a book of the Bible", to be supplied with the customary Introduction and a series of more or less elaborate Critical and Exegetical Notes, which explain the many obscurities of the text in the light of the most modern philological knowledge, spiced, no doubt, with a judicious use of conjectural emendation.

Mr Ellison's "Studies" combine all these approaches. But it would be fair to say that the religious approach is primary. "I undertook the obligation to furnish a series of studies on the Book of Job to *The Hebrew Christian Quarterly* something more than three years ago", he writes. "I had hardly started my task, when a period of suffering and distress broke over me, which profoundly affected my understanding of the book and the scale of my treatment of it." Nevertheless, the literary aspect of the book is not neglected. Nor are the strictly critical and exegetical aspects—indeed, the form adopted is that of many of the more modern biblical commentaries, with two chapters of Introduction, followed by nine more chapters in which sections of the text of the Revised Version (printed in full) alternate with sections of continuous expository commentary.

Mr Ellison is content to take the book very much as it stands: Prologue and Epilogue are the author's own: so, too, are the Elihu Speeches: there are, however, some dislocations in the text. Yet, if the treatment is conservative, it is not unscholarly. Both the introductory chapters and the exposition are necessarily brief; but all is eminently readable—thus, the text of the "Interlude in Praise of Wisdom" (Ch. 28) is preceded by:

> Silence fell on the dung hill, broken only by the call of playing children and the hum of the nearby town. Along the horizon the first hint of thunderclouds showed, while Job's friends looked at one another in terrified anger, and the young man Elihu drew a little nearer.
>
> For twenty-five chapters of thrust and counter-thrust we have heard all the wisdom of the schools and the dogmatism of experience break over Job, only to leave him more unconvinced than at the first and the wisdom of the Wise confounded. To break the tension, to turn our attention from the clash of passion, and to prepare us for God's intervention, the author now introduces a poem on Wisdom. It would seem to be completely false to picture ch. 28 as Job's own words; it would be completely out of character, and 29: 1 should act as a warning against the supposition. We should rather think of a curtain descending for a brief interval at the tensest point of the drama.

H. F. D. SPARKS

APOCALYPTIC

VISIONS OF THE END: A STUDY IN DANIEL AND REVELATION. By ADAM C. WELCH. James Clarke. 12s. 6d.

THIS is a re-issue of a book first published in 1922. The late Dr Welch, Professor at New College, Edinburgh, was well known as an Old Testament scholar. He had been much moved by the first world war, and he was anxious to assist men preparing for ordination after their war-time experiences. He had himself found help in the apocalyptic literature, and he wrote this book in order to convey his findings to others. Since then, we have come through the ordeal of the second world-war, and the publishers have re-issued Dr Welch's book in circumstances similar to those in which it was first written.

The main part of the book consists of six chapters on Daniel and nine on Revelation. The former prophecy dates from the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, and the latter from the reign of Domitian. In each case, the writer is producing a tract for the times; he is "concerned with the immediate present of his fellow-believers and with the immediate future which he foresees as its outcome". But the Christian cannot regard these writings as a preview of coming events; their significance lies in the religious principles which they embody and express.

This is not an elementary introduction; the writer assumes that the text and subject-matter of Daniel and Revelation are familiar to his readers. He provides a thoughtful interpretation which will help them to assess for themselves the permanent value of these two books. Perhaps that is as much as any interpreter can do.

G. J. INGLIS

CREATION AND COVENANT

CHURCH DOGMATICS. Vol. III. The Doctrine of Creation. Part 1. By KARL BARTH. T. and T. Clark. 45s.

WITH regard to the biblical witness two questions arise, what exactly is it that we are asked to believe? and, is it credible? An intelligent answer to the second question is dependent upon a correct answer to the first. The great merit of Barth's *Church Dogmatics* is his unflinching determination to discover and expound the witness of Scripture; and his labours will win the undying gratitude of the Church.

When we ask whether a doctrine is credible, we mean, Is it compatible and coherent with truths which we cannot help accepting? Perhaps at no point has this question forced itself upon attention more than in regard to the Creation. Around this the conflict, supposed or real, between Science and Religion has raged with special ferocity.

Whilst Barth is magnificent in drawing out the spiritual implications of Genesis, he is less successful in relating the Bible to other thought. He draws too sharp a line between revelation and natural theology. The latter has a *locus standi* which he does not appreciate. But he has

rendered imperative an appraisal of the place and function of natural theology.

Few, I imagine, will be able to agree with Barth, that the time of Genesis 1 is "our time"—which must mean a day of twenty-four hours: nor with the contention on p. 318 that God "willed to ignore the rest and to choose his people (Israel) alone": or that "It is not true that we have an immediate awareness of our own or any other reality" (p. 345).

But the way in which Barth links together the doctrines of Creation and the Covenant, which is the real theme of this book is a piece of biblical exposition that it would be hard, if not impossible, to surpass, and renders this volume an indispensable possession for the earnest student of the Bible and of Doctrine.

C. J. Barker

RECONCILIATION

Church Dogmatics. Vol. IV. The Doctrine of Reconciliation. Part 2. By Karl Barth. T. and T. Clark. 55s.

The veteran theologian Karl Barth is pursuing his indefatigable way in the study of the whole Christian Faith, and bequeathing to the Church a precious heritage. It is much that we are enabled to look at the whole range of Christian doctrine through the eyes of a single great mind. Such looking is an essential discipline for every preacher of the Gospel. The presentation of the Faith must never be scrappy or incoherent, but if a multiplicity of small books is one's only reading, the menace of incoherence is never far away. Spiritual and mental enrichment comes chiefly from the pondering of a few great books. Therefore I say to the ordinary minister, buy these books of Barth, and read them with prolonged and concentrated diligence and attention.

Of course there are points on which we shall disagree with Barth; but in thinking out why we disagree we shall be clarifying our own thought and verifying our convictions.

The outstanding merits of this volume of Barth's include his intense interest in real religion; his deep knowledge of Scripture and power as an interpreter; his penetrating ethical insights; his knowledge of the human soul and its ways; his understanding of the situations in which the Church and the individual exist to-day. Over and over again a passing sentence lights up a serious and long felt problem or calls attention to an issue that has been overlooked.

In this volume Barth devotes more attention than in the previous ones to man's side of the Covenant Relation between God and man; and as the work proceeds we find a more balanced view of human nature than sometimes seemed to appear in Barth's work. Man has his dignity and capacities thoroughly appraised in these pages. Always there is the reminder that we only know man when we study him in relation to God; for man does not exist in his reality in isolation, or even independence.

Because Barth is looking at Reconciliation from man's side he devotes much attention to the work of the Holy Spirit. God works not only for man and towards man, but also in man. Through the Spirit the work of Christ as the Royal Man, the representative of humanity is completed: man is awakened, justified, and sanctified: in Jesus Christ his head he returns to God who is his home.

C. J. Barker

BARTH'S "ROMANS"

A Shorter Commentary on Romans. By Karl Barth. S.C.M. 15s.

This is a translation by D. H. van Daalen from the German *Kurze Erklärung des Römerbriefes* published in 1956 but which originated as the manuscript for a course of extra-mural lectures given at Basle in 1940/41. In his preface Dr Barth describes it as "a smaller and younger . . . brother of the 'Epistle to the Romans' of 1918 and 1921" but later adds that "it will be seen at first glance that this is not an extract from the older exposition". The book therefore offers to those who know of Dr Barth and his writings only by hearsay an independent opportunity of direct encounter with a completed work of exposition by him, while to the convinced readers of Dr Barth who cannot read him in his own language there is given the chance of considering his further thoughts on this master epistle of which he is an acknowledged master expositor. Even if—or, perhaps, all the more if—one is not an habitual and devoted reader of Dr Barth and even if one cannot accept as so self-evident as to need no proof the belief that the Epistle to the Romans is the heart, summary, and definitive norm of the New Testament and of the Gospel to which the New Testament bears witness—even so, this is surely a book to read and wrestle with to one's profit. Much of it seems unnecessarily turgid and diffuse (and sometimes the translator fails in his admittedly difficult task and even three or four readings of a sentence do not make sense of it), at points one would feel compelled to argue that the exegesis is perverse or too ingenious but every so often one encounters a discussion which can only be described as shatteringly illuminating so that one can see once again not only why there are "Barthians" but, much more importantly, why Dr Barth is to so many an acknowledged minister of the Word of God.

D. E. Jenkins

A BOOK FOR SCHOOLS

The Life and Teaching of Jesus. By E. Ridley Lewis. James Clarke. 6s.

This is the fourth volume of six in the London Divinity Series, designed to cover the Bible and intended for candidates for the University of London G.C.E. examinations. They are intended for pupils, not for

teachers though if the latter can do as well without as they could do with them they are better informed than I think they are. One who has never taught or examined at G.C.E. level is perhaps not well qualified to appraise this book; but after years of teaching at a later level, which by no means always means a more intelligent one, I am aware that the author of such a book as this, if qualified to write it, is faced with the formidable difficulty of judging what to leave out. Herein Mr Lewis has succeeded admirably. He warns pupils that there are other views and interpretations than those he includes; but there is no nonsense, and pupils who advance further will have little to unlearn, even if they come to change their opinions.

To the New Testament scholar there are some surprising statements. E.g., in the Temptations of Jesus, that to gain the kingdoms of the world is said to be the "most crude" and to indicate Satan's "shortage of ideas", whereas the rulership of the world is the most common of Messianic hopes, held by disciples even after the resurrection. Occasionally Mr Lewis does not seem to have read the New Testament with care: the woman with the issue of blood did not wish to touch "some part of the person" of Jesus but only his garment; and it is inexcusable carelessness to tell pupils that the Feeding story is told *five* times in the gospels: it is related *six* times, and the error is worse because the author includes John 6 in his five and says that the gospels, other than Mark, "give us the story but once each". Again, it is not noticed that Matthew 20. 1-16 continues a subject begun at 19. 16, and has the same point as The Pharisee and the Publican and the Prodigal Son. Nor is there anything to be said for identifying Jesus with the Good Samaritan: parables, as Mr Lewis elsewhere recognizes, are not allegories. And if the *main* point of the Friend at midnight and the Unjust Judge is about "God as One who hears the cry of the needy and comes to their aid" the conclusion is inescapable that he is *reluctant* to do so.

The last two sentences of the book are pious "drip", meaningless for children and unnecessary for anybody else.

J. S. Bezzant

THE FOURTH GOSPEL

Consummatum Est. By Alf Corell. S.P.C.K. 25s.

The Order of the Holy Paraclete, Whitby, has translated this book from the Swedish, and it reads admirably, and fully deserved an admirable translation. It sustains with great insistence the view that St John's Gospel is very deeply concerned with eschatology, and that the End to which the ministry of Jesus looks is to be found partly realized already in the Church and bound up with the future of the Church. The consummation is not for individuals apart from a society of which they are members.

But if the book is insistent in presenting this thesis, the insistence is sober. Its detailed contentions are carefully, though never tediously,

urged, and Dr Corell does not let himself stray far from the text of St John. Most of his interpretations could probably be found scattered about in Westcott's *St John*, but that does not mean that Dr Corell owes anything much to Westcott; he only mentions him once in his text, and in the briefest fashion in the bibliography which lists well over three hundred authors' names. But he has something of the same approach as Westcott, though not with the same object in view, and he altogether by-passes the historicity of the Fourth Gospel with the remark (p. 38) that "St John thinks theologically, not chronologically". This is perhaps truer of Dr Corell than of St John, but Dr Corell thinks theologically to some purpose, and it would be difficult to read his book without finding many problems illuminated and a number of passages enriched with new notions, though some of these, however attractive, may be slightly far-fetched, as for example that the true Vine ties up with the Tree of Life in the Garden of Eden (p. 73). In the author's Preface to the English edition C. H. Dodd and C. K. Barrett are highly praised: agreement is professed with Barrett rather than with Dodd.

The book is very well produced, pleasant to look at both within and without. It is decidedly worth having.

ADAM FOX

BACKGROUND TO THE GOSPELS

JESUS IN HIS OWN TIMES. By S. E. JOHNSON. A. and C. Black. 12s. 6d.

THERE appears to be no end to the making of books on the Dead Sea Scrolls but this volume, while it contains an examination of the Qumran material from first-hand acquaintance with the Scrolls, covers a wider field. It is, in fact, a study of the geographical, cultural, and religious Palestinian background against which the life, teaching, and mission of Christ, and the opposition he encountered, has to be set if the situation is to be accurately understood and evaluated in the light of the recent archaeological discoveries and from other sources of information.

After a survey of the Galilean environment in which the early life and most of the ministry of Jesus was pursued his relations with the Pharisees, the Galileans, and the Essenes are discussed. While he is not considered to have been a member of any party, the extent to which he and the first Christians were influenced by Essenic thought and practice is considered in the light of the Qumran literature. How far the sect of the Scrolls can be equated with the Essenes is one of the many controversial issues which is still in debate, as is the identification of the "Teacher of Righteousness". That he lived in the days of Alexander Jannaeus in the first century B.C. as is suggested, and that Jannaeus was the "wicked priest" who was responsible for the crucifixion of eight hundred Jews referred to in the recently published Nahum midrash, has yet to be established. Nevertheless, contacts between the early Christian community and the Essenes can hardly be denied in view of the many

parallels, notwithstanding the radical differences in their respective teachings and practices, which are given their full weight in this volume.

That our Lord was "not in every way a typical Jew" is stressed, and it is made clear that he was neither a recluse, a neutral, nor a pacifist, or revolutionary. He was "not even a holy man of the usual type", and he did not fit into any conventional pattern. His opponents were baffled and how hostility arose against him is discussed in an interesting and illuminating manner. His vocation was unique, it is affirmed, and it "cannot be summed up in any of the titles used to describe it" in the apocalyptic literature and its terminology. "Nothing less than the historic Christian faith will permanently satisfy those who read and ponder the Bible and are moved by it". And "the Christian faith makes no sense unless the Christ who is proclaimed has an individuality that can be identified in an actual historical person much of whose teaching and activity was remembered and recorded". This is the conclusion reached in this scholarly and provocative book which only requires an index to complete its usefulness for the serious student of Christian origins.

E. O. James

PAULINE RELIGION

The Mind of St Paul. By William Barclay. Collins. 16s.

Dr Barclay is a Scottish divine and preacher. In this book he has gathered together a series of articles written for the *British Weekly*. His study is not so much of St Paul as an individual, as of his religion and his theological teaching. He lays great stress on St Paul's own personal religious experience. "His interest was not in theology but in religion . . . he was concerned to tell men of an experience-based faith by which they might live". At the heart of his religion was his encounter with Christ, and he was "ever discovering new adequacies and new greatnesses in his Lord".

Dr Barclay holds fast to the actual writings of St Paul to elucidate the Apostle's mind. He emphasizes his Jewish background and his wide knowledge of the Gentile world. Selected themes are expounded with lucidity and learning. Among them are the doctrines of God, of Christ, of faith and the meaning of the Cross, of the second coming, of the meaning of "in Christ", of sin and forgiveness, and of the Church. Careful attention is given in their context to the meaning of Greek words used by St Paul, and his exposition of the meaning, for example, of the term "adoption" is most useful.

In so large a field there must be some omissions, but one regrets that there is no chapter on St Paul's sacramental teaching, nor on his interest in ethical questions. The omission of an index makes immediate reference to topics difficult. But as a lucid exposition of many aspects of St Paul's thought this book can be warmly commended.

Marcus Knight

CONSERVATIVE THEOLOGY

THE DEATH AND RESURRECTION OF JESUS CHRIST. By KARL BORNHAUSER. Translated by A. RUMPUS. Independent Press. 18s.

THIS is a strange book. It was written by a Marburg Professor who died in 1947. Mr Rumpus lives in South India, and the book is printed in Bangalore. Paper, binding, and proof reading are all inferior to British standards. Bornhauser was, it seems, much influenced by Schlatter whose work is held by the translator to be vital for New Testament study.

The general impact of the book is conservative and fundamentalist. There are some wild assumptions about the dating of the Gospels. Matthew has priority, and was an eye witness and John was also an eye and ear witness. All four are said to have been written before A.D. 70. Thus in this long exposition of the events of the passion, death, and resurrection of our Lord there is an arbitrary interweaving of all four accounts in the Gospels and the unity which results is often artificial.

At the same time, the exposition is full of interest and not without profit. Dr Bornhauser was an expert in study of the Rabbinic Schools of Jewish theology, and he makes full use of this knowledge in his commentary. He combines this with a wide knowledge of the Septuagint and his discussion of Greek words is always thorough and helpful. The full story of the passion and resurrection is studied with exact care, and the excursus on the fourth word from the Cross and the whole significance of Psalm 22 is well worth reading. The German tendency to speculation is present at many points, especially in the consideration of parts of the resurrection accounts. Yet out of an odd mass of often stony material the reader may here and there sift out some pure gold.

MARCUS KNIGHT

LUKE AS THEOLOGIAN

PROPHET AND WITNESS IN JERUSALEM. By ADRIAN HASTINGS. Longmans. 16s.

THE author of the Fourth Gospel has long been regarded as a theologian as well as an historian. In recent years scholars have shown that Mark too is at least as much concerned with theology as with history. Now we are invited to regard the author of Luke-Acts in the same light. Luke, who had been regarded as a somewhat pedestrian reporter by scholars of the generation of Sir William Ramsay, is described as "Luke the theologian" by A. R. C. Leaney in his recent commentary in the new Black's New Testament series. The same approach is seen in this book, written by a Roman Catholic author and dedicated to the rector and students of the Urban College in Rome. "The gospels *proclaim* Christ, are never mere biographies or works of history, nor of course essays in abstract theology. Rather do they state facts pregnant with theological meaning for a definite purpose—to produce or strengthen faith." (p. 5.)

The author notices Luke's treatment of his Marcan source. He is sceptical about Q, and thinks that Luke knew Matthew's gospel, but in a hypothetical edition, earlier than ours. He tracks down over-confidently the sources of Luke's other gospel material to Philip the deacon, Simon of Cyrene, and Joanna, the wife of Chusa, Herod's steward.

His investigation of Luke's workmanship is more interesting. He writes, "The account of the visit to Nazareth (Luke 4. 16-30) does not aim at mere narration of historical fact: it is meant to do much more, to sum up in advance the whole theme of the gospel. Jesus, forcefully depicted as the prophet in the tradition of Elias and Eliseus, comes to preach the gospel of salvation in Nazareth, which symbolises Israel precisely as being Jesus' *own* city, his own people: what is done at Nazareth will be done by all Israel at Jerusalem . . . . The reference to Naaman and the widow of Sarepta quite naturally pointed to the calling of the Gentiles, just as the behaviour of Nazareth pointed to the behaviour of all Jewry." (p. 100.)

In the same manner he maintains that the so-called "travel document" (Luke 9. 51-19. 28) is dominated by a theological motive. "It is clear from the geographical and time details given that this is not one single historical journey, any more than the visit to Nazareth was one single historical visit." (p. 103.) The whole of this section is seen as dominated by the passion-motif, from its opening words "He set his face steadfastly towards the way that led to Jerusalem" (9. 51), which are interpreted as a fulfilment of Isaiah 50. 7: "The Lord God is my helper: therefore am I not confounded. Therefore have I set my face as a rock". The fact that the verb is changed in the Greek weakens the plausibility of the argument. Indeed this manner of exposition may become a heady wine as when our Lord's death and resurrection on the third day are regarded as prefigured by his parents' loss of him for three days (Luke 2. 46) on his childhood passover-visit to Jerusalem. "Jesus goes up with his own to Jerusalem for the paschal feast, as he was to go up later for the pasch of the passion. He is separated from his people, enters into the world of his Father, and only returns to his people on the third day." (p. 121.)

S. M. GIBBARD, S.S.J.E.

INTRODUCTION TO ST PAUL

THE PAULINE EPISTLES: THEIR MEANING AND MESSAGE. By JAMES T. HUDSON. James Clarke. 21s.

THIS new elucidation of the Pauline and pseudo-Pauline epistles has undoubted merits for students and clergy who, without a competent knowledge of Greek or leisure to keep pace with recent scholarship, need a reliable and modern guide. They will find Mr Hudson's book just what they require: namely a new and usually clear translation, which by means of brackets clarifies the full sense, a marginal synopsis of the argument (perhaps too ample at times), a short critical introduction to each epistle, and a summary of Pauline theology, largely on Bultmann's

lines. There is little doubt that many a perplexed preacher and reader will have good reason for gratitude, and a careful scrutiny bears out the commendation, given by Professor G. H. C. MacGregor of Glasgow, in his foreword.

This being so, a few criticisms are not to be understood as seriously affecting the above. The author is perhaps over ready to "fall for" suggestions which have not yet established themselves: for example it is over-bold to print 1 Cor. 13 in the form of a Pindaric ode, or to explain its structure as that of a Greek temple, or again to adopt Rope's suggestion that in Galations St Paul has "radical" as well as Judaizing opponents, or to read *muhram'atta* for *maranatha* in 1 Cor. 16. 22. Key-words are wisely given uniform translation, but is "open secret" the best that could be found for *musterion*? A dozen or so misprints have been noted, and there are a few slangy phrases like "clap-trap", "God's wrath will get them". If space permitted one would wish to query a few translations and the disentanglement of some intricate arguments. But all criticisms would be of minutiae, and in general the book will be found a useful and reliable companion.

C. B. Armstrong

COMPARATIVE RELIGION

The Comparative Study of Religions. By Joachim Wach. Edited with an introduction by Joseph M. Kitagawa. Columbia University Press. 36s.

In this fourth volume in the series of Lectures on the History of Religions produced by the American Council of Learned Societies the manuscript of Joachim Wach, who died in 1955, has been completed by his sister and the editor, Professor Kitagawa, who has written an introduction giving a brief account of the life and thought of the author. This manuscript was compiled originally for a course of lectures which Dr Wach delivered in India in 1952 and subsequently in various academic institutions in the United States, in which he set out to survey recent developments and methods in the field of *Relgionswissenschaft;* as he described "the science of religion", with a view to framing a theory of religion comprehending the general features in the expression of religious experience everywhere and throughout the ages. In this way he helped to indicate "the lines along which the relations between religions should be directed". Moreover, since in the Barrow Lectures he was addressing an Indian audience, an effort was made to present Western religious thought and practice in a manner intelligible to an oriental intelligentsia reared in a very different environment.

In explaining his conception of the nature and task of *religionswissenchaft* he concentrated primarily on what he regarded as the universal themes in religious thought, utilizing to this end some of the material made available by the comparative study of religions together with that derived from philosophical and theological sources. While the book in its

present form is well-informed it can hardly be said to make a particular contribution to knowledge in any of the several fields brought under review, or to break much new ground either in method or content. Indeed, Dr Wach quite deliberately tried to avoid "expounding new theories and technical aspects" of the subject. His purpose was rather to construct a framework in which adherents of different faiths could better understand each other by an objective approach to the science of religion in the hope that thereby a fuller vision might be obtained of "what religious experience can mean, what forms its expression may take, and what it might do for man". An historian of religions he maintained "has to approach the question of truth phenomenoligically, that is, relating the question of truth to the nature of religious experience". One of his essential functions, in his opinion, was to prepare the ground for the raising of the problem of truth by gathering the necessary data.

E. O. James

BIBLICAL SYNOPSIS

Bible Primer. By Ray Freeman Jenney. Independent Press. 10s. 6d.

This book, first published in America, has its origin in a personal experience of the author. Asked to help a student to an appreciation of Shakespeare's *As you Like it* he wrote a brief synopsis of the plot and its main characters as an indication of the theme of the play. In this present book he endeavours to do the same for the Bible. It is intended primarily for "church school teachers and lay people".

Omitting the Apocrypha, it consists of short sketches of each of the books of the Old and New Testaments treated separately, including a brief analysis of their contents and emphasizing the central theme of each in relation to the wholeness of the Bible. Within the small compass of 190 pages this is no easy task and, in pursuit of his aim, the author reveals conspicuous skill in the art of condensation. He achieves much in this way, but it involves him sometimes in making statements on matters of critical scholarship which are open to serious debate. Of the fourth Gospel, for instance he says, without qualification, that it was "written by a mystic in the first part of the second century". Again, need for compression can hardly justify the absence, in an analysis of the Epistle to the Ephesians, of any specific reference to the Church as the Body of Christ.

There is a brief—all too brief—introduction to the New Testament which touches barely on the critical approach to the Gospels and Epistles. It would be a gain if a simple critical introduction to the Old Testament had been provided. The results of critical scholarship are, however, admitted. Daniel is associated with the Maccabaean resistance movement; Deuteronomy is related to the book found in the Temple in Josiah's reign, but, for the most part, Pentateuchal criticism is left severely alone.

Written in a lucid and attractive style, this book may well be recommended as a stimulus to those for whom it is intended and, if it is used as an introduction to the study of the Bible with a commentary, it will prove a profitable Primer.

A. O. STANDEN

THE MESSAGE OF EASTER

RISEN INDEED. By G. D. YARNOLD. Oxford University Press. 9s. 6d.

THESE "studies in the Lord's Resurrection" are both scholarly and devotional. The combination of qualities is rare, and indeed there are those who think the two terms mutually exclusive, if not actually contradictory. But this book does manage to combine both virtues: the student can learn here how best to approach the history and doctrine of the resurrection while the devout reader will find his prayers and meditations not stultified but enriched.

The author takes us through the main appearances of the risen Christ from the empty tomb to St Paul's experience on the Damascus road. He distinguishes carefully between events in space and time and events in the eternal sphere without denying either, and he gives due prominence to the resurrection life in the Church. There are also six appendices on special problems.

Of the change implied by the empty tomb he says, "It would be more nearly true perhaps to say that matter, tangible, physical matter, has been taken up into the spiritual realm . . . . The grave clothes remain behind as visible and tangible evidence of his triumph." He is sure that "at the central point of the Christian faith it must be possible to assert that objective events occurred, which carried absolute conviction to the eleven." And what, he asks, can these be, if they are not the resurrection appearances recorded in the tradition?

It is a pity that the author is not prepared to apply the same kind of argument to the Ascension. We find him curiously ill-at-ease on this point. We should agree with him that ascension is not the same thing as levitation, but we should not agree that "there is no connection whatever between the two ideas". His anxiety to distinguish the two leads him into a curious mis-statement. "We speak of the 'event' which initiated the earthly life of the Lord as the Incarnation, and the 'event' which concluded the series, thus begun, as the Ascension." But this is not Christian usage. Incarnation is not equal and opposite to Ascension. The correlative term to Ascension is not Incarnation but Conception or Nativity. Is this mistake responsible for the whole doubt about the Ascension?

The book can be strongly recommended to clergy, students, and the intelligent general reader.

W.W.

ALLEGORICAL INTERPRETATION

ALLEGORY AND EVENT. By R. P. C. HANSON. S.C.M. 35s.

IF SPIRITUAL exegesis of Scripture, once more in favour, is not to be simply a means of avoiding modern problems or substantiating ecclesiastical traditions with dubious biblical authority, its principles must be understood and its history and methods examined as objectively as possible. Fortunately there are signs that the scrutiny is taking place, and from a sufficient variety of standpoints to cause a lively debate. There are the *Essays on Typology* by Lampe and Woollcombe, the liberal R. M. Grant's *The Letter and the Spirit*, the Roman Catholic Daniélou's *Sacramentum Futuri*. On Origen, the central figure in early exegesis, there is De Lubac's *Histoire et Esprit*, while Daniélou's *Origen* is also much concerned with this aspect of his work. Dr Hanson's new book, following naturally on his *Origen's Doctrine of Tradition*, is at once a solid exposition of Origen's methods and a lively critique of other writers on the subject.

He begins by distinguishing several traditions of allegorization which are often confused or whose mutual influence, if any, is misjudged. He holds that there was already a full-blooded tradition of allegorizing in Palestinian Judaism of our Lord's day which owed little to Alexandria and from which originated the Christian allegory of realization, while Alexandrian allegory, both Jewish and pagan, was unhistorical in character and exercised almost no influence upon the earliest developments of Christian allegory. Christian allegory was a by-product of typology; Alexandrian, entirely untypological, looked not for fulfilment but for a moral, philosophical, or scientific meaning beneath the literal text. The earlier Fathers (e.g. Justin, Irenaeus) were not Alexandrian in this sense, but Philo's influence, slight at first, becomes strong as time goes on. The all-important question about Origen will be his attitude to history.

Part Two begins by describing the current forms of exegesis which Origen opposed because of their theological consequences—Marcionites repudiating allegory, crudely anthropomorphic literalists, Judaizers, Rabbis, philosophers like Celsus who countenanced pagan allegorization but denied it to Christians. Against all this Origen sought to establish the authority and the true meaning of the whole of Scripture, and his weapon was allegory. Dr Hanson then comes to details, showing how Origen handled the text (Hebrew, Greek, variant readings), how he conceived of inspiration (it amounted, alas, to revelation by propositions), how he thought God accommodated himself to human capacity, how he understood the three senses of Scripture. There are chapters on the Law, Sacraments, and Eschatology, in which last Origen is found seriously deficient. In a chapter on Historicity and in his conclusion Dr Hanson insists that Origen's failure to take history seriously is basically unbiblical. He was a master of the art of exposition as few have been, but his perilous reduction of the significance of history to an acted parable must not be soft-pedalled in the desire to establish him as a

good churchman after all. It is chiefly on this point that Dr Hanson crosses swords with Daniélou and De Lubac.

Such issues cannot be discussed without the detail. This Dr Hanson has studied patiently and he handles it skilfully, keeping our interest with his lively mind, his sturdy independence and, not infrequently, his tart tongue. The debate will continue, and all the better for this excellent book.

S. L. GREENSLADE

THE MEANING OF HISTORY

THE SENSE OF HISTORY: SECULAR AND SACRED. By M. C. D'ARCY, S.J. Faber. 30s.

THIS is an important book on a great subject written with the author's accustomed lucidity and learning and dealing with so many controversial questions that only a long review could do it justice. All that can be attempted here is an indication of the scope of the enquiry with a brief comment on the author's constructive outline of a Christian philosophy of history. "Historicism", which he takes to be synonymous with philosophy of history, is vindicated against the criticism of many historians as a legitimate and distinctive study which seeks to satisfy the need to discover, if possible, some pattern, direction, or "meaning" in the historical process. Fr D'Arcy's own position takes respectful account of the writings of Croce and Collingwood, but with admirable common sense he refuses to dissolve historical facts into ideas. His argument to prove, against scepticism, that we can have "certain" knowledge of past events is worthy of attention, though it will not persuade Mr Bertrand Russell. We are given admirable accounts of the views of some of the recent writers on Historicism, including Tillich, Barth, Toynbee, and C. S. Lewis, and we note that our author has the intellectual virtue of fairness to those with whom he disagrees.

All this valuable material is prolegomena to the sketch of a Christian philosophy of history which Fr D'Arcy modestly sets before us as a tentative essay. It is here, of course, that the wish to argue with the author is almost irresistible. Few Christians will want to dissent from the guiding principle of his sketch—that the Headship of Christ is a fruitful conception when we are considering the Christian doctrine of the end of history, though we have reservations on the development of this thought. The difficulty of distilling from Scripture a coherent philosophy of history is not the meagreness of the data, but their disconcerting variety. There are at least five complexes of ideas, or mythological themes, in the Bible, from each of which something like a philosophy might be evolved. We have, first, the Prophetic apprehension of the divine guidance of events; we have also the Priestly conception, which differs from the prophetic; the Apocalyptic outlook, again, is distinctive and includes the idea of the conflict between the Kingdom of God and the demons, which plays an important part in the New

Testament; St Paul has his own interpretation of history (possibly two different interpretations); St John probably should also be included in our list, for he seems to suggest a new view of the relation between time and eternity; lastly, and one might think most important of all, we have the recorded teaching of Jesus. To weave all these into a coherent theory is indeed a formidable enterprise and we should recognize the difficulty before we criticize Fr D'Arcy's valiant attempt at synthesis. The attentive reader will notice one really surprising omission; the index does not include the reference "Kingdom of God", and the book has no discussion of the meaning of this phrase. Surely any Christian Historicism ought to begin with the idea of the Kingdom, which was the theme of Jesus' teaching and the motive of his acts. Too easily, perhaps, Fr D'Arcy identifies the Kingdom with the Church.

The author invites us to compare Bossuet's Christian Historicism with his own. The comparison is instructive. The earlier theologian pointed to history as a confirmation of the faith; the contemporary theologian contemplates the confused spectacle of history with faith, in the hope that he may discern some traces of Providence hidden from unbelievers. The contrast is, in itself, a notable lesson in history.

W. R. Matthews

THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

Eighteenth Century Church and People. By S. C. Carpenter. John Murray. 35s.

One of Dr Carpenter's great virtues as an historian is that, like his predecessor, Eusebius, he incorporates a large proportion of his sources into his text. This habit serves not only as a guarantee of good faith but gives the reader a welcome sense of living in immediate contact with the great figures of the period.

And a most interesting period it is, which the last generation of historians damned outright and the present has tried hard to rehabilitate. Dr Carpenter is content for the most part to let it tell its own story without *parti pris*. He is conspicuously fair to the Evangelicals and disarms criticism in advance by admitting that his derivation of the party from William Law is "surprising". It is not so surprising as the apparent suggestion that Ken's best known hymns were written during his retirement (p. 62), and that the Archbishop of Canterbury might have addressed the German Lutheran Prince as "Head" of the English Church (p. 88).

But there are very few places where one would venture to question, much less disagree with, Dr Carpenter. He is to be warmly congratulated on the completion of his fine trilogy. He has succeeded in writing a book that does not contain a single uninteresting line. If we miss the mingled excitement and exasperation aroused by the controversialist, we must admit that in its own particular *genre* this latest addition to our shelves

is as nearly perfect as it could well be. It will long remain a delight not only to study but to read.

W.W.

WELSH CHURCH HISTORY

JOURNAL OF THE HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF THE CHURCH IN WALES. Volume VIII. Edited by E. T. DAVIES. Historical Society of the Church in Wales. 10s. 6d.

VOLUME VIII of the *Journal of the Historical Society of the Church in Wales* has an informative article by Canon David Thomas on the well and chapel at Holywell, associated with the seventh-century British saint Winifred, and now, after a long and chequered history, being cared for by the Ministry of Works.

For the rest, this issue of the *Journal* is chiefly concerned with what the Prayer Book rubric calls "Briefs, Citations, and Excommunications". "The Excommunications in the Book of Llan Dâv" is the title of Chancellor James's contribution. Archdeacon Gwynfryn Richards concludes his series on "Royal Briefs for the Restoration of Churches in Wales"; while that one-time popular expedient for money-raising, the Brief, makes yet another appearance in Mr W. T. Morgan's article "The Consistory Courts in the Diocese of St. Davids".

The arduous task of the seventeenth or eighteenth-century churchwarden could be rendered even harder when the holder of the office suddenly found himself cited to appear before the local consistory court because some of the parishioners had taken exception to his handling of the church accounts. Among examples quoted, is one from Nantmel in Radnorshire, where the churchwardens for the year 1709 were accused of having spent money too freely upon ale during the discharge of their duties. "Our ancestors", comments Mr Morgan, "were, it seems, quite incapable of discussing even the most trivial matters affecting the parish without liquid refreshment".

Certainly, the study of Church History affords comfort to frail humanity!

GORDON HUELIN

POST-REFORMATION CATHEDRAL

CHESTER CATHEDRAL. By R. V. H. BURNE. S.P.C.K. 21s.

THIS is the small beer of history, but it is the authentic home-brewed, and Archdeacon Burne keeps up the quality right to the end of the cask. There is no full-dress Post-Reformation history of any of our cathedrals, and in supplying this want from the records at Chester he has made an important contribution to English Church history, and at the same time has supplied his readers with a fascinating story. The detail which he

gathers from the documents is, of course, of local interest in the first place, but it reflects the march of great events in the world outside the close and lights up many problems of cathedral history upon which scholars would like to be better informed. For instance he is able to show a probability that there was continuity between the end of the monastic regime and the beginning of the capitular regime. It looks as if the services were carried on and the old organization merged itself into the new. The greatest difference must have been the substitution of a small professional choir for the singing of the whole body of monks, and much of Archdeacon Burne's material concerns this choir. It consisted of six conducts, or lay clerks, and eight choristers. It is curious that eight choristers seems to have been a usual number in the provisions of Henrician statutes (there were eight both at Ely and Worcester) though it would be considered much too small for present day needs, when at least sixteen choristers are needed to balance six lay clerks. Perhaps the explanation is that in 1541 the music sung was mainly plain-song. With the growth of polyphony in the church services eight boys would never be able to sustain their part, and this perhaps accounts for the appearance at Chester of "demi-choristers" (so called no doubt because they received half the exhibition of a foundationer) to strengthen the treble line. The organist in 1541 was the ex-schoolmaster of the monastery, and this is parallel with Ely where there was no organist, so called by name, at all, but only a master of the choristers. It reminds us that the instrument was still in a primitive state of development, and that the teaching and conducting of unaccompanied singing was the main need. At Chester, and no doubt elsewhere, the organist derived some of his income from "pryking of straunge songs". The choristers were not always so well behaved as might be wished, and the treasurer provides spikes on the choir parclose screens 'for boies climbing over". But neither were the conducts, or even the organist himself, above mutinous misbehaviour. In 1737 the Chapter ordered that anthems were to be sung in the choir, and not in the organ loft "unless it be upon tryal of any new one". No doubt in a time of general slackness the organist and lay clerks had managed to ensconce themselves out of sight in the loft, perhaps on the pretext that better singing would result. It also appears that the anthem was not chosen until the canons and choir has assembled for service. The residentiary canon then ordered the anthem and, from time to time as the Chester records show, the choir or organist, or both, refused to sing it! In 1674 the canons tried to make the Sunday choral services more appropriate for congregational worship, a task which has been essayed by many a dean and chapter in more recent times. Their way of doing it was to order that the canticles should not be sung to "full" settings, in which, by the contrapuntal mingling of the parts, the words could be more easily lost, but should be sung to "verse" settings, in which one or two parts only would be employed, or even in "the ordinary chanting tune" in which the congregation might easily bear a part. The same restriction was placed upon anthems. Fortunately this pastoral urge of the chapter cannot have

lasted for long, or the whole of the choir's repertoire would have been lost. But the choir evidence is only a part of Archdeacon Burne's valuable study. It sheds light upon the establishment, for a brief period, of the "common table" at which all, except the dean and canons, had their dinner, which was cooked by the College cooks and served by the butler and other servants. During the eighteenth century the dean was often a pluralist and an absentee, some of the canons were also irregular in residence, and this lack of interest at the head must have affected the lower ranks. But Archdeacon Burne warns us not to read back into the history the standards and ideals of our own age. The records give us a delightful picture of Bishop Downham's wife behaving like a sixteenth-century Mrs Proudie, and also touch upon the search for a deodand mare who had no doubt caused the death of her rider and was therefore forfeit to those who held the privilege of deodand. Her anxious owner was hiding her till the search should have died down. Great events affected the Cathedral when James II visited Chester on his progress through the west to prepare the ground for the repeal of the penal laws; and it was sacked in the riots which took place when Monmouth was currying favour for his rebellion. At this time the dean and chapter kept a "light horse", an animal which was exercised by one of the vergers and was the source of frequent trouble and expense. It would be impossible to list even a tithe of the interesting topics, both great and small, with which Archdeacon Burne delights every cathedral lover, and I can only conclude by saying that I found his book full of interest on every page.

SEIRIOL EVANS

VICTORIAN STRIFE

ANGLICAN ATTITUDES. By A. O. J. COCKSHUT. Collins. 16s.

THE jacket discloses the photograph of a delightfully smiling schoolboy. The text reveals the mind and heart of a sexagenarian. What schoolboy could write of the connecting link between Colenso and Gray with such sympathetic insight, "Each was a devoted missionary; each had sacrificed for his faith an easy life among friends and familiar things in England—an unspectacular sacrifice, perhaps, but one which strikes daily at the heart over long years"?

This sentence is by no means a flash in the pan: it is typical of an understanding and penetration that run throughout the book. In dealing with the three great ecclesiastical cases of the Victorian period—Gorham, *Essays and Reviews*, and Colenso—the author consistently brings out the best in the leaders on each side of the controversy. He maintains his independence of judgement and displays no *parti pris*. It is quite the most objective and illuminating treatment of the period we have yet seen.

Of course in order to obtain his clarity of effect the author has continually to sharpen the point. The issues were never quite so clear-cut as he makes them appear. But that is a legitimate procedure. A century has intervened since then and we are better able to see the consequences of tendencies than were the contemporaries.

The author points no moral, although at the end he lets it be seen that in his view the bishops come out of the struggle with enhanced prestige. Perhaps the most obvious lesson to be drawn is the absurdity of trying to regulate doctrine by the processes characteristic of civil law. One would hope that the book will put an end to any project of maintaining the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council as the final court of appeal in ecclesiastical cases. But before we shout this sentiment too triumphantly there is one sobering reflexion that fairness forces us to make. However stumbling and even stupid the procedure of the Committee sometimes seems to have been and however dubious its theological standing, its judgements did in effect prevent the extreme wings from destroying each other and so helped to preserve that comprehensiveness without which Anglicanism would lose its distinctive character. This must surely be borne in mind when we are framing the new courts.

Young as the author appears to be he has already produced a well reviewed book on a literary subject. This is his first excursion into the historico-theological field. We hope he enjoys his surroundings so much that he will take up his abode in them.

W.W.

EVANGELICAL BISHOP

THE FIRST EVANGELICAL BISHOP: SOME ASPECTS OF THE LIFE OF HENRY RYDER. By G. C. B. DAVIES. Tyndale Press. 1s. 6d.

THE want of a biography of Henry Ryder (1777-1836), the first Evangelical to be raised to the episcopate, has long been felt. It is therefore gratifying to be able to draw attention to an admirable and illuminating study. That Ryder would have been preferred from the Deanery of Wells to the Bishopric of Gloucester in 1815 if he had not been the brother of Lord Harrowby is indeed improbable: his appointment was criticized in the House of Lords because he was an Evangelical, and in 1824 King George IV assented only under protest to his translation to the united see of Lichfield and Coventry, which then included Birmingham and Derby. Henry Ryder was one of the most exemplary bishops of his time; and, although the materials for his biography are scanty, Professor Davies has made the most of them. This remarkably inexpensive pamphlet is a very important contribution to the history of the Evangelical Revival.

C. H. SMYTH

BIOGRAPHY OF A GIANT

THE LIFE OF ST JOHN OF THE CROSS. By CRISOGONO DE JESUS. Translated by KATHLEEN POND. Longmans. 45s. Pocket edition, text, map and index only, 18s.

SOONER or later, and the sooner the better, those who provide us with fare for our spiritual reading will have to come to terms with the vast range of new insights which New Testament scholarship has suggested during the past fifty years. Père Bouyer rightly observes: "St Augustine, St Jerome, still more Origen, if they had had within reach all the possibilities we have, would have profited from them to an extent far beyond that with which the majority of us content ourselves." If there is to be any accommodation of the devotional life to the insights of the best scholarship, your reviewer makes the prophecy that it is with John of the Cross that the process will begin. John less than anyone, perhaps, of his own day was guilty of that fatal demarcation "this world—the other world", which is so false to the theology of the New Testament. Above all, John would have agreed with the verdict of Jerome, that to be ignorant of the Bible is to be ignorant of Christ.

For all those reasons, the English translation of the definitive life of the Friar John is an event of major importance, and it is sad to think that an untimely death has robbed the world of the distinguished author of this work. To have some of the fonder legends of the professional hagiographer exposed is always entertaining ("Sheer legend", says Father Crisógono of one such visionary embellishment), but the exposing of such accretion is not quite so often accompanied—as it is here—with corresponding research and scholarship. For the first time we have the early years of John set into a context of the Spanish world of his time, while—again for the first time—we can see how extensive and (in our academic sense of the term) "liberal" were his studies at the Jesuit College. It would have been worth the publication to have had this part of John's life, even had we had nothing else.

The Carmelite quarrels, which in so many books (we here do not include Professor Peers) have the flavour of a merely domestic disturbance, are given fair and erudite treatment by our author, and are set against the framework of the contemporary currents in church life in Spain.

John, the man, the ecclesiastic, the friar, the man of letters, the guide of souls in every age—all comes to life in a splendid example of technical biography. But it is as the man of prayer that we welcome this portrait of John.

John of Fécamp, Friar John, Lancelot Andrews—all have this in common: that in their published prayers and writings it is often hard to discover *who* is praying, whether the author, the Bible, or the Liturgy. That is as it should be, and our own generation, which has seen so much of liturgical and scriptural recovery, may well turn to John to learn how to pray Holy Scripture.

Will someone please tell your reviewer what Enchiridion of Augustine is meant by Juan Evangelista's reference to Augustine's *Contra Haereses* (p. 226)?

C. S. MANN, O.S.B.

EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY DISSENT

GEORGIAN CHRONICLE. By BETSY RODGERS. Methuen. 21s.

"WE LOST the rage of our peculiar devotion, &, from cruel & snarling critics (as all *Reviewers* are known to be) were metamorphosed into happy & good-tempered men." Such was the soothing effect which the *Poems* of Anna Laetitia Aikin (alias Mrs Barbauld), first published in 1773, had upon a writer for the *Monthly Review*.

Mrs Rodgers records this in her *Georgian Chronicle*, wherein she relates the story of an eighteenth-century Nonconformist family, which numbered among its distinguished members the lady who, besides her *Poems*, wrote *Hymns in Prose* and other best-sellers for children. Indeed, the success of her moral and instructive juvenile literature was so great, that Charles Lamb, far from being soothed, raised the complaint that "Mrs Barbauld's stuff has banished all the old classics of the nursery".

Of the many topics touched upon by Mrs Rodgers in her book, and in the sixty or so unpublished letters which form an appendix, perhaps the most important is the part played in eighteenth-century education by the Dissenting Academies. The significance of this contribution has become increasingly apparent, and it receives an additional appraisal here by reason of the fact that Dr John Aikin, the father of Anna Laetitia, was a tutor at the newly-formed Warrington Academy, later known as "the Athens of the North".

In this her third volume on the Georgian era, the author has presented a skilfully constructed portrait of a family from whom she is herself a descendant.

GORDON HUELIN

THE STORY OF OUR REDEMPTION

THE MEANING OF THE CROSS. By H. E. W. TURNER. Mowbrays. 8s. 6d.
THE MEANING OF SALVATION. By E. K. LEE. Mowbrays. 5s.

PROFESSOR Turner has followed up his admirable Lincoln Passiontide Lectures on *The Patristic Doctrine of Redemption* by an equally helpful series of Holy Week Lectures at Cuddesdon which he has entitled *The Meaning of the Cross*. The pattern of the book is entirely clear. First man's predicament is defined in terms of sin as Transgression, Disobedience, Estrangement, Frustration, and Disorder. Five types of Atonement-theory, answering respectively to each of these definitions, are then expounded as the Juridical, the Ethical, the Psychological, the Personal, and the Cosmic. Finally a rather longer chapter deals with

God's Initiative and Man's Response, laying special stress upon the different ways in which Catholic and Evangelical have understood the doctrine of Justification by Faith.

Although Professor Turner seems often to be traversing well-worn ground he has many fresh and illuminating comments to make on the way. His concern all the time is to hold on to valuable emphases from varying traditions and the dialectic between Catholic and Evangelical in the final chapter is quite excellently worked out. I find his distinction between Psychological and Personal rather too finely drawn but otherwise his general pattern seems to me to cover all the essential aspects of the problem. It would not be easy to think of a better short survey of Atonement-theories and all the time the writer is drawing on his wide knowledge of Scripture and history to point the way to the *experience* of reconciliation in human life.

Mr Lee's book is more directly devotional and practical. He seeks to meditate upon the wonder of God's love in saving mankind and to show how it calls for a comprehensive response in the Church, in the individual soul, and in society generally. The material is well-organized but the writing lacks that freshness of treatment that is to be found in Professor Turner's book.

F. W. Dillistone

THE FAITH OF A SCIENTIST

Science and Christian Belief. By C. A. Coulson. Collins. 2s. 6d.

Professor Coulson's John Calvin McNair lectures, delivered at the University of Chapel Hill, North Carolina, in 1954 and published by the Oxford University Press in 1955, have now been made available to a wider public in Fontana Books. They are a moving confession of faith on the part of a distinguished theoretical physicist who is also a leading Methodist layman.

Professor Coulson begins by repudiating the apologetic which "finds God in the gaps", i.e., which introduces God to explain those aspects of the world which science has not yet explained; as he points out, with the progress of science the gaps get progressively smaller and the place left for God approaches zero. Rather, he insists, God must be recognized from the beginning and everywhere; and he devotes a large part of his lectures to arguing that the attitude of the scientist is a fundamentally religious attitude which can be justified only if the basis of the world is a spiritual basis. Against those who make science the judge of all things, he argues further that the scientific approach to the world does not exhaust all the world's aspects and that the insights of the various approaches—scientific, aesthetic, and the rest—can be fully integrated only on a religious, and indeed on a Christian basis. He is conscious that such an interpretation might not seem to get further than pantheism, but he goes on to maintain that a fully comprehensive synthesis is

bound to see the ground of the universe as personal. Here, I must confess, his argument seems to me to be insufficient, for the essence of pantheism is not that it holds the ultimate reality to be impersonal but that it identifies God with the universe; a thorough discussion of the notion of creation seems needed here and it would take the whole matter into the realm of metaphysics and indeed of theology. I wonder, in fact whether scientific considerations alone can take one quite as far as Professor Coulson thinks. His book is nevertheless of great value for the demonstration which it provides of the fact that, whatever may have been the case in the past, a modern scientist, so far from finding his religious convictions undermined by his scientific work, can find his scientific work made meaningful and brought to life by the faith which he accepts as a Christian.

E. L. Mascall

PHYSICS AND DOGMAS

Science and Religion in Seventeenth-century England. By Richard S. Westfall. Yale University Press; London: Oxford University Press. 36s.

This is an intensely interesting and highly detailed study, in which under a variety of aspects there is set before us the consistent and devoted attempt made by the Christian virtuosi of the seventeenth century—such men as Kenelm Digby, John Wilkins, Samuel Hartlib, Robert Boyle, Robert Hooke, and, above all, the towering figure of Isaac Newton—to reconcile with the Christian religion the newly-born deterministic mathematical physics which in the two succeeding centuries was to effect such a gigantic and profound transformation in the life and thought of mankind. The story is a sad one, for out of the mass of material which the author has gathered and skilfully arranged the fact that clearly emerges is that, almost without recognition and certainly without intention, the virtuosi brought about their reconciliation by modifying the traditional Christian belief to the point of destruction. "While they were protesting vigorously that natural philosophy was in harmony with Christianity, they were quietly and perhaps unconsciously altering Christianity to meet their own definition." (p. 71.) Providence was interpreted simply as "the general benevolence of the original creation and the continual sustenance of the natural order." (p. 102.) "In theory natural religion was meant to supplement Christianity, to provide it with a rational foundation; in practice it tended to displace it." (p. 106.) Arguments ludicrous in their superficiality and circulatory were used to prove that the world had been designed for the comfort and happiness of man; the high light is provided by Nehemiah Grew, with his point that the horse has ears turned to the rear so that it may hear the voice of its driver. In spite of the ingenious defences of supernatural religion made by thinkers such as

Thomas Browne, Isaac Barrow, and John Mapletoft, the final position was that reached by Newton who, without realizing it, had abandoned traditional Christianity altogether. "He combined and consolidated the series of modifications in the Christian tradition made by the virtuosi. Each modification was relatively minor in itself, and none of them constituted a break with Christianity, yet their cumulative effect as seen in Newton's statement of Christianity attenuated the Christian tradition to the verge of disintegration." (p. 217.) "In defending Christianity in this manner, they prepared the ground for the deists of the Enlightenment—the mechanical universe run by immutable natural laws, the transcendent God removed and separated from His creation, the moral law which took the place of spiritual worship, the rational man able to discover the true religion without the aid of special revelation." (p. 219.) Newtonian determinism no longer holds the scientific field, and the story, though not its aftermath, is now a thing of the past, but it provides a tragic warning against attempts to bring the Christian religion into line with contemporary thought. It may, however, be suggested that the story might have had a happier ending if at the critical period English theology had been in a more vigorous and constructive condition.

Mr Westfall writes with extreme clarity and objectivity and—which is not universal in books on this kind of topic—with an accurate understanding of traditional Christianity. His work is all the more impressive for its detachment and lack of emotion.

E. L. Mascall

SACRAMENT AND LITURGY

Covenant and Sacrifice. By Basil Minchin. Longmans. 10s. 6d.

Here is an ideal book for a parish priest to recommend to those of his congregation who want to enter more deeply into the liturgical aspect of sacramental worship. Mr Minchin admirably surveys the biblical and historical background of the Eucharistic and Baptismal rites, four chapters being devoted to the Eucharist and one to Baptism. Particularly useful is his exposition of the meaning of sacrifice in relation to the Eucharist, an exposition reared solidly on biblical foundations. His treatment of both the Eucharist and Baptism ends with a consideration of modern problems connected with their administration and he has some sensible things to say about baptismal reform. There is also a balanced discussion on the topical problem of uniformity and change in the liturgy, in which he points out that it is a problem of a two-fold duty: of churchmen to be loyal to the established liturgy and of ecclesiastical authority to keep the liturgy in touch with the mind of the Church by timely revisions. The sub-committee of the 1958 Lambeth Conference, which dealt with the Book of Common Prayer, suggested that in a revision of the Prayer Book Eucharist, the events for which thanksgiving is made in the Prayer of Consecration should not be confined to Calvary,

but include all the acts of redemption, particularly our Lord's resurrection and ascension and his return in glory. In an appendix Mr Minchin includes such a prayer of his own composition. It shows how this type of Consecration Prayer can give the Eucharistic rite a classic beauty, proportion, and dignity. Mr Minchin's prayer has the advantage of not making use of the Prayer of Oblation. Although he provides that after the Communion the Prayer of Thanksgiving is said, the Prayer of Oblation would in his rite come equally appropriate here, thus enabling a more Patristic Consecration Prayer to be combined with one of the most valuable features of the existing Prayer Book service.

G. W. O. Addleshaw

ORTHODOX SPIRITUALITY

The Undistorted Image: Staretz Silouan, 1866-1938. By Archimandrite Sofrony. Faith Press. 18s.

The citizen of the Eastern Roman Empire, Mr Norman Baynes has told us, had two heroes. One was the winner of the chariot race and the other was the ascetic monk. The day would seem to be far off when the Englishman will bracket the footballer with the saint as joint objects of his enthusiastic admiration. "Abide with me" at the end of a match is but a slender link. And perhaps the English readers who welcome this book will be small in number. But they will be rewarded. After the martyr who yields up his life for Christ, the monk is to the Orthodox the Christian *par excellence*: and "monk" means the silent contemplative ascetic found (though in diminishing number) on Mt Athos.

Such a one was Simeon Ivanovitch Antonov, son of a peasant family in the Tambov province of Russia, who lived in the Panteleimon Monastery on Athos from 1892 until his death just twenty years ago. The Archimandrite Sofrony tells the facts of his childhood and youth, and again of his death, briefly in simple and direct words, and something of the principles which controlled his spiritual endeavour during his forty-six years in the monastery. In religion his name was Silouan: and in the end he became the Staretz Silouan, and the book contains a photograph of him. It shows a shrewd but kindly bearded face beneath the monastic cap, a strong prominent nose and deep-set eyes under bushy brows. It fits in well with what we read. It is a story of struggle, of passionate desire to learn humility, of the ardent practice of prayer.

The latter half of the book consists of extracts from the written notes of the Staretz himself. They are surprising enough from one who had next to no education as a child, and reflect a very profound spiritual experience. The poetic diction at times recalls the liturgical texts.

This is a book to add to others which have recently appeared and help to interpret Orthodox spirituality to the Western mind.

R. M. French

C.S.I.

GREAT VENTURE. By A. H. DAMMERS. Highway Press. 2s. 6d.

THE Lambeth Conference of 1948, meeting a year after the inauguration of the Church of South India, expressed the hope and desire that ignorance and misunderstandings might be dispelled by increasing communication between the Church of South India and the Churches and Provinces of the Anglican Communion. The 1958 Conference report affirmed that this hope and desire had borne fruit and that the visits of delegations and individuals had contributed greatly to the knowledge and experience which were essential for the formation of sound judgement.

The Vicar of Holy Trinity, Millhouses, Sheffield, has written a charmingly personal account of the four years which he and his family spent in South India, during which time he worked first at Bangalore and later at St John's College, Palamcottah, where he was Chaplain and Lecturer. This is a brief personal testimony every bit as moving as Bishop Lesslie Newbigin's *South India Diary*. Like other visitors to India, Mr Dammers' over-riding impressions were clearly of the poverty of the people and the immense size of the missionary task. Whilst he writes with real warmth and enthusiasm of the life and achievements of the C.S.I. he brings out clearly the severe limitations of Christian unity in South India and emphasizes the failure so far to bring about any effective discussions with the extremely active Pentecostal sects.

Mr Dammers includes an interesting account of the C.S.I. liturgy and sets forth its advantages over the 1662 service. He also shows how the Anglican rite of Confirmation, the Methodist Class meeting, and the Presbyterian practice of Eldership are all contributing to the life and worship of the C.S.I. He concludes with a challenging appeal for ordinary people with ordinary gifts to go out from the West and to give themselves to India and the Indian Church. It is emphasized that C.S.I. needs Anglicans, both Evangelical and Anglo-Catholic, and that it would be a great blessing if one of the Anglican religious orders could establish a house in loyal membership of the C.S.I.

This little book is of far greater significance and importance than its mere 62 pages may suggest at first sight.

R. D. SAY

SALVATION STORY

THESE LAST DAYS. By A RELIGIOUS OF C.S.M.V. Faith Press. 9s. 6d.

THIS book is the kind of erudite work which we have learned to expect from a writer now known throughout the Anglican communion as "A Religious of C.S.M.V". It has a sub-title "Time seen through Christian eyes": and it is an ambitious project to compress within a hundred pages a survey from the creation of man to the day of doom.

No historian can write without presuppositions. This author's presuppositions and methods are sufficiently indicated by three quotations. Of physical death as a result of the fall we read "It is the inevitable consequence of the vitiation of our nature, and as such brought upon ourselves—since we were all in our first parents when they sinned" (p. 28). The account of our Lord's baptism contains these sentences, "St. Mark alone actually mentions it as being '*into* Jordan', which implies immersion. . . . As in the beginning (of creation) water is here the hostile element; our Lord's immersion in it, His suffering it to close over His head, denotes Him as the Champion who undertakes to fight the enemy. His emergence from it signifies His victory." (p. 55.) Of the last judgement it is said, "God will use the sky as His blackboard in that Day, on which to write the sign of our redemption, though by what means He will do so we do not know" (p. 73).

This stimulating book should force each Christian reader to ask himself in what terms, if not in these terms, he would tell "the story of our salvation": and that surely is a story every Christian should be prepared to tell.

S. M. GIBBARD, S.S.J.E.

REASON AND RESURRECTION

THE EASTER ENIGMA. By MICHAEL C. PERRY. Faber. 21s.

THIS is a thoroughly wholesome book, which (since it deals with "psi" ideas and categories) it might easily not have been. Although it is written perhaps chiefly for the enquirer, it makes useful reading for the convinced Christian, both as a summary of evidence and as a discussion of doubts and difficulties which every Christian ought to have faced. Part I deals with the evidence, and Part II with the various attempts which have been made to reconcile it with the science of parapsychology—which has nothing to do with spiritualism.

The author gives reason, in Part II, for his own opinion that telepathy makes the most convenient "bridge" to the beginning of understanding of the resurrection. This positive approach to the problem, in chapters 13 and 14, is not entirely satisfactory: he suggests that the risen Jesus projected appearances of himself upon the minds of the various witnesses of the resurrection; but he finds himself compelled to assume that the appearances were misunderstood, in that the disciples were convinced that the apparition was tangible and could eat and drink when in fact neither was true. It is no real answer to say that God "allows" human misinterpretations; if this were true God could not be absolved from causing them. For if the risen Christ was so limited by the spirit of the age that he was compelled to acquiesce in this, he was responsible for a Christian view of the spiritual dimension which is false: yet this is the Christian view which has given battle to the escapists—the *soma sema* school—for nineteen centuries. The solidity of the risen Christ must not be soaked out of the gospel: we must not be Docetists even after Easter. But I admire the author's determination to be positive, and

to shirk no difficulties: chapters 13 and 14 may well be signposts, and the author himself insists that they can be no more.

A few small points may be mentioned. "Did the Ascension occur on the evening of the first Easter Day, or later?" (p. 72.) Mr Perry is in distinguished company in assuming the Ascension to have been a sudden affair. But "I am ascending", said Jesus to Mary Magdalene. The significance of the forty days is surely that Christ will take believers with him: they need time, and God denies this to no man. On p. 78, and pp. 205f., it was the beloved disciple who recognized Jesus at the lakeside and then told Peter: it was not Peter's own intuition: just as it was the same disciple who "saw and believed" at the empty tomb. This might expose the "telepathic theory" to the objection that the telepathic promptings came from this disciple, and not from the risen Christ.

This is a book both straightforward and scholarly: it is free from theologian's jargon, though inevitably sprinkled with "psi" technical terms in Part II. It is a pleasure to read.

H. A. Blair

RELIGION AND PSYCHOLOGY

Christ and Freud. By Arthur Guirdham. Allen and Unwin. 21s.

When Freud challenged the validity of religion for maturely developed personalities and characterized it as a "universal obsessional neurosis", a fixation in and reversion to infantilism, he opened up a field of thought which continues to be increasingly explored. As Dr Gregory Zilboorg has recently pointed out, the full synthesis, if synthesis there be, between psychoanalysis and religion has not yet been found. The truth certainly does not reside in rejecting either psychoanalysis or religion.

Dr Guirdham, a practising psychiatrist, makes an interesting and provoking contribution to the discussion. Freud, he says, was mainly right in his attack upon religion but wrong in universalizing his attack. His criticisms hold of the Judaeo-Christian religion of the Western world, but not of the mystic apprehension of God nor of the non-personal religions of the East, Buddhism and Hinduism. Christianity, he asserts, and by that he means the teaching and practice of the Christian Churches, has failed to follow Christ in rejecting the Judaic tradition. In consequence they have set up systems of religion which inevitably produce neurosis on a large scale. The offending elements are the conception of God as a person rather than a spiritual omnipresent influence (Dr Guirdham is vague on what he himself really understands God to be), the emphasis on sin and guilt and the need to seek forgiveness from God, the teaching on resurrection and the hope of continued personal existence, the doctrine of the grace of God which conflicts with the claim of freedom of the will. The essential mistake is the cult of personal existence, for this seeks separate existence, whereas the aim of true religion must be to lose self by absorption in or unity with the non-personal God.

Dr Guirdham spoils his case by his assumptions and outrageous generalizations. Not only does he show a failure to understand the true nature of Buddhism and Hinduism both theologically and psychologically, he applies different criteria in his interpretation of them and of Christianity. He writes as if the loftiest forms of Hinduism and Buddhism were universally current in the East, except in Tibet, whereas he continually takes the crudest interpretations of Christianity as being its essence, rejecting any more spiritual or more enlightened interpretation as held only by a few non-typical Christians. Of course he eludes criticism by asserting, "Religion is emphatically not to be established by any form of theorising. . . . It is either a truth of experience or nothing." If his experience shows him that non-existence is the highest goal of life, who then can criticize him!

Christians would do well not to be antagonized by the crudities which he ascribes to them nor by the dogmatic mode in which Dr Guirdham presents his arguments. Even if the weaknesses of the Christian position are not nearly as universal as he claims, they are nevertheless prevalent enough to make it worth the effort required to sift the good from the bad in his criticisms. His book is provoking, exasperating, and in general fallacious, but much of it ought to be taken very seriously to heart.

R. S. Lee

A CONGREGATIONALIST VIEW

Why not Abandon the Church? By Bernard Lord Manning. Independent Press. 6s. 6d.

These four short talks in vigorous defence of Congregationalism were given at Easter 1938 and published the following year. They now appear again unrevised and inevitably "dated". Dr Joad is said to teach that science has made belief in God impossible: and there is no footnote to remind the reader of his wonderful and complete conversion. Mr Garvin is said to purvey Mussolini's teaching weekly for twopence. The question is posed whether a Unitarian Prime Minister should advise the Sovereign on the appointment of bishops. But, datedness aside, it is not clear why this book has been re-published. The temper of controversy has changed in twenty years. Prayer Book doctrine that by baptism an infant becomes "the child of God" may be mistaken, but few nowadays would dub such teaching as "false and hideous". Nor are there many responsible critics who so misunderstand Catholic sacramentalism as to call it magical. These are only instances of a general ethos, which is specially to be regretted in a respected Fellow of a Cambridge College, who has produced more constructive work. Dr S. M. Berry opines in an Introduction that these lectures provide just the right sort of reading for young people: and presumably he still adheres to this, as he allows his commendation to re-appear in 1959. The whole production is disappointing in this eirenic ecumenical age

Frederic Hood

GTU Library
3 2400 00270 6699

DATE DUE

MAR 2 2 2000

MAR 2 2 2000

OCT 0 2 2001

OCT 4 2002

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

THREE DAY
The Church quarterly review

v.160
1959

v.160
1959 THREE DAY 339501

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION LIBRARY
BERKELEY, CA 94709